arXiv:1205.1205v1 [math-ph] 6 May 2012

A ballistic motion disrupted by Bragg reflections

Jeremy Thane Clark
jclark@mappi.helsinki.fi
University of Helsinki, Department of Mathematics
Helsinki 00014, Finland

March 3, 2013

Abstract

I study a Lindblad dynamics modeling a quantum test particle in a Dirac comb that collides with particles from a background gas. The main result is a homogenization theorem in a semi-classical limiting regime involving large mass for the test particle and a rescaling for the strength and period of the Dirac comb. Over the time interval considered, the particle would exhibit essentially ballistic motion if either the singular periodic potential or the kicks from the gas were removed. However, the particle behaves diffusively when both sources of forcing are present. The conversion of the motion from ballistic to diffusive is generated by occasional Bragg reflections that result when the test particle's momentum is driven through a collision near an element of the half-spaced reciprocal lattice of the Dirac comb.

1 Introduction

The production of periodic light force potentials for atoms and molecules in laboratory settings has enabled the experimental examination of several fundamental quantum phenomena, which include: Bose-Einstein condensation, Bloch oscillations, Zener tunneling, and Bragg scattering [1, 7, 4]. Bragg scattering of particles from optical gratings yields a particularly vivid picture for the wave-like nature of matter predicted by quantum mechanics [18, 5, 9]. This enhanced quantum scattering is a consequence of the wave coherence amplifications that periodic media generate.

In this article, I demonstrate that a mesoscopic particle in a singular periodic potential can exhibit a strong diffraction-generated effect in the presence of a noise. In fact, the noise has a cooperative role in driving the test particle into temporary states in which coherence is developed through the Hamiltonian dynamics. Coherent superpositions enter the dynamics primarily in the form of Pendellösung oscillations and quickly collapse into classical superpositions between forward and reflected waves through collisions. The Pendellösung oscillations develop infrequently in comparison to the gas collisions, at instances in which the test particle's momentum is kicked close to a value such that the de Broglie wavelength is an integral fraction of π^{-1} multiplied by the potential's period, i.e., momenta satisfying the Bragg condition for reflection. Nevertheless, the test particle undergoes Bragg reflections frequently enough to restrain its motion, yielding diffusive transport in contrast to the ballistic transport dominating when either the singular periodic potential or the noise is removed. If the periodic potential is smooth rather than singular, then diffractive effects will be negligible.

The mathematical results of this article extend those from [6], which considered the same quantum model under different parameter scalings. The previous work focused, firstly, on the derivation of a classical Markovian dynamics governing the momentum distribution in a semi-classical limit of the original quantum dynamics and, secondly, on a central limit theorem for the time integral of the classical momentum process. More precisely, the "momentum" process was associated with the extended-zone scheme momentum for the periodic potential. Although [6] provided a heuristic argument that the spatial transport behavior for the original quantum model should be closely related to the behavior found in the time integral of the idealized momentum process, the mathematical connection was not clear. The analysis here shows that the quantum model transport in the specific limiting regime considered reduces to the classical process studied in detail before.

1.1 Model and result

I will consider a quantum Markovian dynamics in which the state ρ_t of the particle at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a density matrix in the space of trace class operators $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ over the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and whose time evolution is determined by the Lindblad equation (1.2). For concreteness, I take the initial state to be $\check{\rho} = |\mathfrak{g}\rangle\langle\mathfrak{g}|$, where the wave function $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathcal{H}$ has a Gaussian form in the position representation given by

$$\mathfrak{g}(x) = e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}\mathbf{p}} \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{4b^2}}}{(2\pi b^2)^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \qquad b, \mathbf{p} > 0. \tag{1.1}$$

In words, the test particle begins in a pure Gaussian state concentrated around the origin in position and traveling to the right with momentum $\mathbf{p}$. For the Hamiltonian H and the completely positive map $\Psi : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ defined below, the dynamics in the Schrödinger representation is determined by the quantum Kolmogorov equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar}\big[H, \rho_t\big] + \Psi(\rho_t) - \frac{1}{2}\{\Psi^*(I), \rho_t\}. \tag{1.2}$$

The Hamiltonian is a Schrödinger operator with a periodic δ-potential (Dirac comb) given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2M}P^2 + \alpha \sum_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta\big(X - aN\big),$$

where $P := -\mathrm{i}\hbar\frac{d}{dx}$ is the momentum operator, X is the position operator, M is the mass of the test particle, $\alpha > 0$ is the strength of the potential, and a is the period. The map Ψ describes the noise and has the continuous Kraus form

$$\Psi(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, j(v)\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}\, \rho\, e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $j(v) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is the rate-density for momentum kicks of size v. I will assume that the rates have the reflection symmetry $j(v) = j(-v)$ and satisfy that $\sigma := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, j(v)\, v^2$ is finite. In (1.2), $\Psi^*(I)$ is the adjoint map Ψ^* evaluated for the identity operator I on $\mathcal{H}$, and it is easy to compute that $\Psi^*(I) = \mathcal{R}\, I$ for $\mathcal{R} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv j(v)$.

I will study a limiting regime of the dynamics in which the constants $\mathbf{p}$, M, $\hbar$, α, a scale with a parameter $0 < \lambda \ll 1$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_0\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad M = M_0\lambda^{-1}, \quad \hbar = \hbar_0\lambda^{1+\varrho}, \quad \alpha = \alpha_0\lambda^{2+\varrho}, \quad a = a_0\lambda^{1+\varrho}, \tag{1.4}$$

for fixed constants $\mathbf{p}_0$, M_0, $\hbar_0$, α_0, a_0 and some exponent $\varrho > 0$. I will also take the spatial width b of the initial Gaussian state to scale proportionately to the spatial period a of the potential: $b = b_0\lambda^{1+\varrho}$ for some $b_0 > 0$. The value b could be much larger, although it must be smaller than the spatial scaling for the central limit theorem in Thm. 1.2. Since the initial state and the solutions to the master equation (1.2) depend on the parameter $\lambda > 0$, I will denote them respectively by $\check{\rho}_\lambda$ and $\rho_{\lambda,t}$.

I will have the following technical assumptions on $j(v)$:

Rate assumptions 1.1. *There is a* $\varpi > 0$ *such that*

1. $\int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, j(v)\, e^{r|v|} < \varpi$ *for some* $r > 0$,

2. $\sup_{-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a} \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} j\big(\theta + \frac{n\pi\hbar}{a}\big) < \varpi$,

3. $\inf_{v\in[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}]} j(v) \geq \varpi^{-1}$.

Define the constants $\nu := \frac{\mathcal{R}M_0\alpha_0}{2\hbar_0}$ and $\vartheta := \frac{\mathbf{p}_0^3}{\nu M_0^2}$. The theorem below states that the position distribution for the test particle at time $\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}$ for $\lambda \ll 1$ and $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ is approximately a Gaussian distribution with variance $T\vartheta$ when normalized by the factor $\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Pick* $\frac{1}{2} < \gamma < 1$ *and* $\varrho > \gamma$. *Let* $\rho_{\lambda,t}$ *be the solution to (1.2) under the parameterization (1.4) and* $D_{\lambda,t} \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ *be the density determined by* $\rho_{\lambda,t}$ *for the position distribution. Define the measure* $\mu_{\lambda,T}$ *to have the density:*

$$\frac{d\mu_{\lambda,T}}{dx}(x) = \lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}} D_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}x).$$

For each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, *the measures* $\mu_{\lambda,T}$ *converge in law as* $\lambda \to 0$ *to a mean-zero Gaussian with variance* $T\vartheta$.

Theorem 1.3 characterizes the test particle's motion without the Dirac comb or the random kicking from the gas. In those situations, the test particle retains an effectively ballistic motion with speed $\frac{\mathbf{p}}{M}$, and the position distribution at time $\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}$ is centered around the location $\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\frac{\mathbf{p}}{M} = \frac{T\mathbf{p}_0}{M_0}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}$. In particular, diffractive effects do not appear without the aid of random kicks from the environment.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* γ, ϱ, $D_{\lambda,t}$, *and* $\rho_{\lambda,t}$ *be as in Thm. 1.2 except with* $\alpha = 0$ *(no Dirac comb) or* $\Psi = 0$ *(no noise). Define the measure* $\mu_{\lambda,T}$ *to have the density:*

$$\frac{d\mu_{\lambda,T}}{dx}(x) = \lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}} D_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}x).$$

For each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, *the measures* $\mu_{\lambda,T}$ *converge in law as* $\lambda \to 0$ *to a* δ*-distribution at* $\frac{T\mathbf{p}_0}{M_0}$.

1.2 Discussion

1.2.1 The Dirac comb

The Schrödinger Hamiltonian $H = \frac{1}{2M}P^2 + \alpha\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\delta(X - an)$, $\alpha > 0$ is defined mathematically as a particular self-adjoint extension of the symmetric operator $-\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ with domain consisting of all L^2-functions on $\mathbb{R}$ with two weak derivatives in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and that take the value 0 on the lattice $a\mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $f \in \mathbf{H}^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \{g \,|\, g(an) = 0,\, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The operator domain of the self-adjoint extension is the space of functions that have one weak L^2-derivative in the domain $\mathbb{R}$ and two weak L^2-derivatives in $\mathbb{R} - a\mathbb{Z}$, and that satisfy the boundary condition

$$\frac{2\alpha M}{\hbar^2} f(an) = \frac{df}{dx}(an+) - \frac{df}{dx}(an-)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The Dirac comb and other Schrödinger operators formed by linear combinations of δ-functions are discussed extensively in [2].

The spectrum of the Hamiltonian H is continuous, and there are a continuum of kets $|p\rangle_Q$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and a dispersion relation $E : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that the Hamiltonian can be formally written as

$$H = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp E(p) |p\rangle_Q \, {}_Q\langle p|.$$

This representation is related to standard Bloch theory through the extended-zone scheme, and I will discuss the connection in Sect. 3. For the Dirac comb, the dispersion relation and eigenkets have closed forms. The dispersion relation is given by $E(p)=\frac{1}{2M}\mathbf{q}^2(p)$ for the anti-symmetric, increasing function $\mathbf{q}:\mathbb{R}\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ determined by the convention $\mathbf{q}(\frac{n\pi\hbar}{a})=\frac{n\pi\hbar}{a}$ for $n\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$, the Krönig-Penney relation for $p\in\mathbb{R}-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$:

$$\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}p\big)=\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)\big)+\frac{\alpha M}{\hbar\mathbf{q}(p)}\sin\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)\big), \tag{1.5}$$

and continuity at zero. The dispersion relation $E(p)$ has a roughly parabolic shape $E(p)\approx\frac{p^2}{2M}+\frac{\alpha}{a}$ except for momenta near the lattice values $p=\frac{n\pi\hbar}{a}$, $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, where there are gaps $g_n:=\big|E(\frac{n\pi\hbar}{a}+)-E(\frac{n\pi\hbar}{a}-)\big|$. The kets $|p\rangle_Q$ can be constructed as discrete combinations of the standard momentum kets:

$$|p\rangle_Q=\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}\eta(p,m)\big|p+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m\big\rangle, \tag{1.6}$$

where the coefficients $\eta(p,m)$ satisfy $\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}|\eta(p,m)|^2=1$ and have the form

$$\eta(p,m):=-\mathrm{i}N_p^{-\frac{1}{2}}\big(e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)-p)}-1\big)\Big(\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}(p)+p+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m}+\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}(p)-p-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m}\Big)$$

for a normalization constant $N_p>0$.

1.2.2 The noise and Lindblad dynamics

The physics literature on decoherence and matter-wave optics includes many experimental [12, 16] and theoretical [11, 10, 15, 17, 24] studies in which a quantum noise of the form (1.3) appears. The noise map Ψ satisfies the Weyl covariance relation

$$\Psi\big(e^{\mathrm{i}aP+\mathrm{i}bX}\rho e^{-\mathrm{i}aP-\mathrm{i}bX}\big)=e^{\mathrm{i}aP+\mathrm{i}bX}\Psi(\rho)e^{-\mathrm{i}aP-\mathrm{i}bX},\qquad a,b\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{1.7}$$

This means that the rate of collisions is invariant of both the position and the momentum for the test particle. In particular, the noise does not generate dissipation in energy, since it does not include any frictional contribution that would systematically drag a “high momentum” down to lower values. The noise predicts a gradual stochastic acceleration to higher momenta over time, which is apparent in the linear mean energy growth found in the model:

$$\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho_{\lambda,t}]=\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho_{\lambda,0}]+\frac{\sigma}{2M}t.$$

Nevertheless, the model is an accurate description of a massive particle interacting with a gas of light particles over a limited time period. A three-dimensional version is derived from a quantum linear Boltzmann equation in [23, Sect.7.1]. Also, there is a mathematical derivation from a singular coupling limit in [13]. Attention to the structure of completely positive maps and quantum dynamical semigroups satisfying the symmetry (1.7) and other classes of symmetries can be found in the work of Holevo [14].

The quantum Kolmogorov equation (1.2) determines a unique strongly continuous semigroup of completely positive maps $\Phi_{\lambda,t}:\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ that preserve trace: $\mathrm{Tr}[\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)]=\mathrm{Tr}[\rho]$. Technical questions regarding the construction and uniqueness of the solution $\Phi_{\lambda,t}$ do not follow from Lindblad's basic result [19], since the Hamiltonian part of the dynamics is unbounded. I have discussed these technical issues in [6, Appx.A], although the details are trivial due to the exceptionally simple form of the noise.

1.2.3 Physical picture

For the scaling (1.4) with $\lambda \ll 1$, I imagine the particles in the background gas to have mass M_0 and the reservoir to be at a fixed temperature β^{-1}. The initial kinetic energy $\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2M} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_0^2}{2M_0}\lambda^0$ of the test particle has the same order in λ as the temperature β^{-1}. The parameter $\lambda = \frac{M_0}{M}$ is the mass ratio of a single reservoir particle to the test particle, and the $\lambda \ll 1$ regime is consistent with the Brownian limit in which the noise term (1.3) arises. The rates become approximately frictionless in the large mass limit, since the reservoir particles move at speeds on the order $(\frac{1}{M_0\beta})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ compared to the slower speed $\frac{\mathbf{p}}{M} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_0}{M_0}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for the test particle. The collisions with the gas generate an unbiased random walk in the test particle's momentum with jump rate density $j(v)$, and the fluctuations in the momentum over the interval $t \in [0, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}]$ will be of order $\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for small λ. Thus, without the potential, the momentum will typically not deviate far from the initial value $\mathbf{p}$ on the scale of $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_0\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ itself, since $\gamma < 1$.

A typical matter-wave smeared over several period cells of the Dirac comb will have a potential energy on the order of $\frac{\alpha}{a} = \frac{\alpha_0}{a_0}\lambda$, which is small for $\lambda \ll 1$ in comparison to the kinetic energy of the test particle $\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2M} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_0^2}{2M_0}\lambda^0$. The de Broglie wave will tend to transmit freely through the potential except for momenta near elements in $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$, which are those satisfying the Bragg condition for reflection. Each lattice momentum $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ has a neighborhood with diameter roughly given by $\frac{M\alpha}{2\hbar|n|}$ where Pendellösung oscillations between the reflected and transmitted waves appear non-trivially. More precisely, the "diameter" $\frac{M\alpha}{2\hbar|n|}$ associated with the lattice element $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n$ is an integral of reflection probabilities over the interval $[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\frac{2n-1}{2}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\frac{2n+1}{2}]$, which vanish away from the center $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n$; see (1.10). The diameters of the reflection bands contract more quickly as $|n| \to \infty$ for smooth periodic potentials. Since the test particle travels with a momentum near to $\mathbf{p}$, any Bragg scattering that occurs will have a diffraction order with magnitude $\frac{\mathbf{p}a}{\pi\hbar} \propto \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \gg 1$. Despite this high diffraction order, the Pendellösung oscillations in the reflection bands occur at a faster rate than the rate $\mathcal{R}$ of collisions. To argue this point, I identify the minimal speed for the high-order Pendellösung oscillations with the value

$$\liminf_{|p|\to\infty} \inf_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{Z},\\ n\neq 0}} \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\Big|E\big(p+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n\big) - E\big(p\big)\Big| = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\liminf_{n\to\infty} g_n = \frac{\alpha}{\pi\hbar a},$$

where g_n is the nth energy band gap. However, $\frac{\alpha}{\pi\hbar a} = \frac{\alpha_0}{\pi\hbar_0 a_0}\lambda^{-\varrho}$ is $\gg \mathcal{R}$ for small λ. The first equality above uses that the momenta $p + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n$ and p must belong to different energy bands, and thus be separated by an energy band gap. In summary, the Pendellösung oscillations are nearly non-existent except for momenta in the reflection bands for which the oscillations are rapid.

By the above considerations, the critical factor in determining the transport behavior stated in Thm. 1.2 is how frequently the test particle's momentum is likely to fall into the reflection bands randomly through kicks from the gas. The behavior of the test particle will be ballistic in nature if the reflections are infrequent, and in the contrasting scenario, frequent reflections will lead to cancellations in the test particle's motion that elicit a central limit scaling for the spatial dispersion. Since the test particle momentum does not deviate far from the initial value $\mathbf{p}$, the relevant reflections bands are all approximately of width $\frac{\pi M\alpha}{2a\mathbf{p}}$. The setting can be reduced to the random walk on $\big[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}\big)$ given by contracting the momentum of the test particle modulo $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}$, and there is a single reflection band of diameter $\frac{\pi M\alpha}{2a\mathbf{p}}$ centered around the origin. The contracted random walk is ergodic to the uniform distribution over the interval, and the probability of reflection after a generic collision is $\frac{M\alpha}{2\hbar\mathbf{p}}$. The frequency of Bragg reflections is equal to the frequency of collisions multiplied by the local averaged probability for reflection after a collision: $\mathcal{R}\frac{M\alpha}{2\hbar\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\mathcal{R}M_0\alpha_0}{2\hbar_0\mathbf{p}_0}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus, there will be on the order of $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \gg 1$ reflections over the time interval $[0, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}]$.

For $\widetilde{T} := \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}$, the following list summarizes the consequences for the $\lambda \ll 1$ scaling regime:

$M \gg M_0$	Heavy particle limit
$\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2M} \gg \frac{\alpha}{a}$	Kinetic energy is typically greater than the energy stored in potential
$\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{T}^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll \mathbf{p}$	Deviation from initial momentum through collisions over interval $[0, \widetilde{T})$ is small
$\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a} \propto \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$	Reciprocal lattice spacing has the same order as individual momentum transfers
$\inf_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_n}{2\pi\hbar} \gg \mathcal{R}$	Pendellösung oscillations in the reflection bands are rapid compared to collisions
$\widetilde{T}\frac{\mathcal{R}\alpha M}{2\hbar\mathbf{p}} \propto \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}$	Number of Bragg reflections over time interval $[0, \widetilde{T})$ typically has order $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}$
$\frac{\mathbf{p}}{M}\frac{2\hbar\mathbf{p}}{\mathcal{R}\alpha M} \propto \frac{a}{\lambda^{1+\varrho}}$	Typical distance traveled between reflections has order $\dfrac{a}{\lambda^{1+\varrho}} = a_0$

1.2.4 Semi-classical heuristics for the result

The analysis in Sects. 5-7 reduces the proof of Thm. 1.2 to the study of a classical Markovian process $(Y_t, K_t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where Y_t and K_t are defined below and have units of position and momentum, respectively. The analogous statement to Thm. 1.2 for the classical process is the following: For each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the renormalized random variables $Y_{\lambda,T} := \lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}} Y_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}$ converge in distribution as $\lambda \to 0$ to a normal distribution with mean zero and variance $T\vartheta$. The classical process was my primary focus in [6], and Sects. 8 and 9.5 revisit some of the proofs that reduce due to the simpler setup of this article. The simplicity here is a consequence of the short time scales considered over which the position process does not have variable-rate diffusive behavior. If the time scale $\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}$ were replaced by $\frac{T}{\lambda}$, then there would be fluctuations in the momentum on the order of the initial momentum $\mathbf{p} = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{p}_0$; however, this clearly complicates a characterization of the position distribution, since the diffusion rate $\vartheta = \frac{|\mathbf{p}_0|^3}{M_0\nu}$ appearing in Thm. 1.2 depends on the initial momentum.

The position component for the classical process is a time integral of the momentum $Y_t = Y_0 + \frac{1}{M}\int_0^t dr K_r$, and the momentum component is a Markovian jump process for which the rate of jumps $J(p, p')$ from $p' \in \mathbb{R}$ to $p \in \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$J(p,p') := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} j\Big(p - p' - \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n\Big)\left|\kappa_{p-p'-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}(p',\, n)\right|^2,$$

where the values $\kappa_v(p, n) \in \mathbb{C}$ are defined through the coefficients appearing in (1.6) as

$$\kappa_v(p,n) := \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \overline{\eta}\big(p + v + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n, m - n\big)\eta(p, m). \tag{1.8}$$

I take the initial distribution $(Y_0, K_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ to be in the joint density $(\pi\hbar)^{-1}e^{-\frac{1}{2b^2}x^2 - \frac{2b^2}{\hbar^2}(p-\mathbf{p})^2}$, which is the Wigner transform of the initial state $\check{\rho}_{\lambda}$.

The values $|\kappa_v(p,\, n)|^2$ satisfy the normalization $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |\kappa_v(p,\, n)|^2 = 1$. It follows that the escape rate $\mathcal{R} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp J(p, p')$ is invariant of the current momentum p'. A jump for the process K_t from a momentum $p' \in \mathbb{R}$ can be understood as composed of a sum $v + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n$ in which $v \in \mathbb{R}$ has density $\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ has conditional probabilities $|\kappa_v(p',\, n)|^2$ given p' and v. The component v is the momentum transfered to the test particle through a collision with a gas particle, and $\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n$ is the momentum transfered through Bragg scattering. When $|p| \gg \frac{M\alpha}{\hbar}$, the Bragg scattering component approaches an ideal form monopolized by transmitted and reflected waves:

$$|\kappa_v(p,\, n)|^2 \approx \begin{cases} 1 - \Pi_-\big(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{2}\theta\big) & n = 0, \\[1ex] \Pi_-\big(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{2}\theta\big) & n = -\mathbf{n}, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\theta \in \big[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}\big)$ are determined by

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{a}{\pi\hbar}(p + v - \theta) \quad \text{with} \quad \theta = p + v \,\mathrm{mod}\, \frac{\pi\hbar}{a},$$

and the probability $\Pi_- : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ is defined through

$$\Pi_-(p) := \frac{\frac{1}{2}\big(\frac{\alpha a M}{4\pi^2\hbar^2}\big)^2}{\big(\frac{a}{2\pi\hbar}p\big)^2 + \big(\frac{\alpha a M}{4\pi^2\hbar^2}\big)^2}.$$

Notice that $p + v - \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbf{n} \approx -p - v$ is approximately a reflection of $p + v$.

Since the Bragg scattering is dominated by reflections and the collisions with the light particles from the gas typically do not generate large fluctuations in the massive test particle's momentum within the time interval $[0, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}]$, the absolute value of the test particle's momentum will satisfy

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}]} \frac{\big||K_t| - \mathbf{p}\big|}{\mathbf{p}} \ll 1. \tag{1.9}$$

Consequently, the reflection probability $\Pi_-\big(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{2}\theta\big)$ is approximately equal to $\Pi_-\big(\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{2\pi\hbar}\theta\big)$. The reflection times are effectively determined by a series of coin flips with probabilities $\Pi_-\big(\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{2\pi\hbar}\theta_n\big)$ that depend only on the values $\theta_n \in [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ of the contracted momenta $K_{t_n} = \theta_n \,\mathrm{mod}\, \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}$ at the collision times t_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The chain θ_n is Markovian with transition density from $\theta' \in [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ to $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ given by

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} j\big(\theta - \theta' + \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n\big).$$

Since the chain is exponentially ergodic to the uniform distribution over the torus, the probability of reflection at a given collision time is nearly

$$\frac{a}{\pi\hbar} \int_{-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}}^{\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}} d\theta \Pi_-\big(\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{2\pi\hbar}\theta\big) \approx \frac{\alpha M}{2\hbar\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\alpha_0 M_0}{2\hbar_0 \mathbf{p}_0}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{1.10}$$

Thus, the number of Bragg reflections $\mathbf{N}_t$ for times $t \in [0, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}]$ behaves as a Poisson process with rate $\mathcal{R}\frac{\alpha M}{2\hbar\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}}$, since the collisions have rate $\mathcal{R}$.

To motivate that the spread in position scales proportionally to $\lambda^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{1}{4}}$, I will again use that the absolute value of the momentum deviates little from the value $\mathbf{p}$ as in (1.9) by replacing the momentum K_t by the process $(-1)^{\mathbf{N}_t}\mathbf{p}$. In other words, the momentum effectively flips between the values $\mathbf{p}$ and $-\mathbf{p}$ with Poisson rate $\frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}}$. The random variable $Y_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}$ is approximately

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} = \frac{1}{M}\int_0^{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} dr K_r &\approx \frac{\mathbf{p}}{M} \sum_{n=0}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}} (-1)^n \big(\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n\big) \\ &\approx \frac{\mathbf{p}}{M} \sum_{n=0}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}} (-1)^n \big(\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n - \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\nu}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

where τ_n are the reflection times. The second approximation above neglects an additional $\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{\nu M}$ when $\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}$ is even. The random variables $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n$ are close to being independent mean-$\frac{\mathbf{p}}{\nu}$ exponentials, and thus $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n - \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\nu}$ has nearly mean zero and variance $\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{\nu^2}$. The expression (1.11) is a central limit theorem-type sum including around $\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \approx \frac{T\nu}{\lambda^\gamma\mathbf{p}}$ terms and having variance

$$\Big(\frac{T\nu}{\lambda^\gamma\mathbf{p}}\Big)\Big(\frac{\mathbf{p}^4}{\nu^2 M^2}\Big) = T\vartheta\lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - \gamma}.$$

Therefore, the random variable $\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}Y_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}$ should be expected to be distributed approximately as a Gaussian centered at zero and with variance $T\vartheta$ when λ is small.

1.3 Organization for the article, preliminary notation, and unit conventions

1.3.1 Organization

I will adopt a top-down organization for the mathematical content of this article:

- Section 2 includes the proofs for Thms. 1.2 and 1.3 following statements of the main propositions that enter into those proofs.
- Sections 3 and 4 discuss the symmetries relevant to the dynamics and the structures necessary to formulate them.
- Sections 5-8 each include a proof for one of the propositions stated in Sect. 2 and the statements for propositions supporting the proof.
- Section 9 contains the proofs for the propositions stated in Sects. 3-8.

1.3.2 Notation

The following is a partial summary of notation. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Hilbert space, $\mathfrak{b}$ be a Banach space, $\mathfrak{m}$ be a measure space.

Sets:	$\mathbb{T}$	Torus identified with the Brillouin zone $[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a})$
	$\mathcal{I}_a$	Spatial interval $[-\frac{a}{2},\frac{a}{2})$
Spaces:	$\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$	Bounded operators over the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}$
	$\mathcal{B}_1(\mathfrak{h})$	Trace class operators over the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}$
	$\mathcal{B}_2(\mathfrak{h})$	Hilbert-Schmidt operators over the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}$
Norms:	$\|f\|_p$	L^p-norm for $p\in[1,\infty]$ and a measurable function $f:\mathfrak{m}\rightarrow\mathfrak{b}$
	$\|G\|$	Operator norm for a linear map $G:\mathfrak{b}\rightarrow\mathfrak{b}$
	$\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}$	Trace norm for an element $\rho\in\mathcal{B}_1(\mathfrak{h})$

Note that the trace norm has a boldface subscript.

1.3.3 Unit Conventions

The reader should not forget that the quantities $\mathbf{p}$, M, $\hbar$, α, a, and b each scale with $0<\lambda\ll 1$. I will follow the convention that the bounding constants $C>0$ in the statements of propositions are unitless. Also, I will often insert $\frac{\hbar}{a}=\frac{\hbar_0}{a_0}$ and $\frac{\hbar_0^2}{a_0^2M_0}$ as reference units for momentum and energy, respectively.

2 Proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

The proofs of Thms. 1.2 and 1.3 are contained in Sects. 2.1 and 2.2, respectively.

2.1 The diffusive case

I will go through the main part of the proof for Thm. 1.2 after defining notation and stating the main technical results that the argument depends upon. The goal of the analysis in the quantum setting is to approximate the relevant quantities by analogs corresponding to the classical process (K_t, Y_t) discussed in Sect. 1.2.4. To reach the classical quantities, there are three intermediary approximations, which are roughly characterized by the following:

(I). **Momentum to extended-zone scheme momentum approximation:** The integral kernel $\langle p_1 | \rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} | p_2 \rangle$ for the state $\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}$ in the momentum representation encodes the limiting spatial diffusive behavior in the region near the diagonal $p_1 = p_2$; see the proof of Thm. 1.2 below. However, the state $\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}$ has nearly the same integral kernel in the momentum representation and the extended-zone scheme representation. Propagation for the position variable can effectively be treated as if it were generated by the extended-zone scheme momentum rather than the standard momentum.

(II). **Quantum Freidlin-Wentzell limit:** The evolution of the density matrix $\rho_{\lambda,t}$ over the time interval $r \in [0, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}]$ has an approximate decomposition in the extended-zone scheme representation that emerges for $\lambda \ll 1$. The limiting decomposition is such that the off-diagonal functions $\big[\rho_{\lambda,t}\big]_Q^{(k)} \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ formally defined through

$$\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(k)}(p) := {}_Q\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \big| \, \rho \, \big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \rangle_Q \tag{2.1}$$

are approximately given by $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} \big[\check{\rho}_\lambda\big]_Q^{(k)}$ for a contractive semigroup of maps $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$. The dynamics along the off-diagonal fibers of the density matrix are thus approximately autonomous. This feature is a consequence of the relatively fast time scale of the Hamiltonian dynamics compared to the noise and is analogous to Freidlin-Wentzell theory for classical dynamics [8].

(III). **Semi-classical approximation:** Fiber decompositions such as in the idealized form remarked upon in (II) are characteristic of translation covariant dynamics. The Markovian process (K_t, Y_t) has a translation covariant law, so an analogous decomposition applies. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be the joint density for the random variable (K_t, Y_t). For each $k \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a contractive semigroup $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0}^{(k)} = \mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$ for all times $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}(x,p) e^{\mathrm{i}xk}$. The semigroups $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$ and $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$ are close for small k, and through this connection the problem reduces to the classical case. The approximations depend on $\hbar$ being smaller than other relevant comparable scales.

Let $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ be the semigroup with generator $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,k}$ that acts on elements $f \in \mathcal{T} := \big\{ f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \, \big| \, \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp |p| \, |f(p)| < \infty \big\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,k} f\big)(p) = & -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar} \Big(E\big(p - \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big) - E\big(p + \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big) \Big) f(p) \\ & - \mathcal{R} f(p) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp' J_{\lambda,k}(p,p') f(p'), \end{aligned}$$

where the kernel $J_{\lambda,k}$ is defined as

$$J_{\lambda,k}(p,p') = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} j(p - p' - n) \kappa_{p-p'-n}\big(p' - \frac{\hbar k}{2}, \, n\big) \overline{\kappa}_{p-p'-n}\big(p' + \frac{\hbar k}{2}, \, n\big) \tag{2.2}$$

for $\kappa_v(p,\, n)$ given by (1.8). The operator $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,k}$ is closed when assigned the domain $\mathcal{T}$, and the semigroup $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} = e^{t\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,k}}$ is contractive. The semigroup of maps $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is defined to have generator $\mathcal{L}'_{\lambda,k}$ with domain $\mathcal{T}$ and operation given by

$$\big(\mathcal{L}'_{\lambda,k} f\big)(p) = \mathrm{i}\frac{kp}{M} f(p) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp' \Big(J(p,p') f(p') - J(p',p) f(p) \Big). \tag{2.3}$$

For $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, let $[\rho]^{(k)} \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ be defined analogously to $[\rho]_Q^{(k)}$ as

$$[\rho]^{(k)}(p) := \big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \big|\, \rho \,\big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \big\rangle.$$

The functions $[\rho]^{(k)}$ and $[\rho]_Q^{(k)}$ are extractions from the off-diagonals for the kernels of ρ in the momentum and extended-zone scheme momentum representations respectively, and these objects are discussed more rigorously in Sect. 3. The descriptions (I), (II), and (III) correspond respectively to Lem. 2.1, Thm. 2.2, and Lem. 2.3.

Lemma 2.1. *For $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\iota = \frac{1-\gamma}{3}$, there is a $C > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < 1$ and $|k| \leq \lambda^{\iota} \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\hbar}$,*

$$\Big\| \big[\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(k)} - \big[\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]_Q^{(k)} \Big\|_1 \leq C\lambda^{\iota}.$$

Theorem 2.2. *For $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, there is a $C > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < 1$ and $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$,*

$$\Big\| \big[\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]_Q^{(k)} - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \big[\breve{\rho}_\lambda\big]_Q^{(k)} \Big\|_1 \leq C\lambda^{\varrho - \gamma}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *There is a $C > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < 1$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$,*

$$\Big\| \Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} \big[\breve{\rho}_\lambda\big]_Q^{(k)} - \mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} \Big\|_1 \leq C\big(\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}} + \mathcal{R} t \lambda^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varrho}{2}}\big).$$

Theorem 2.4. *For $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the processes $Y_\lambda = \big(\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{4} - \frac{1}{2}} Y_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}},\ s \in [0,T]\big)$ converge in law as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ to a Brownian motion with diffusion constant ϑ. In particular, the characteristic functions of the densities $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy the pointwise convergence as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ given by*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dp \mathcal{P}_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(x,p) e^{\mathrm{i}xu} \longrightarrow e^{-\frac{T\vartheta}{2}k^2}$$

for $u := \lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{4} - \frac{1}{2}} k$. The convergence of the processes Y_λ is with respect to the uniform metric.

Proof of Thm. 1.2. Let $\varphi_{\lambda,T}$ be the characteristic function for the probability measure $\mu_{\lambda,T}$. To show that $\mu_{\lambda,T}$ converges in distribution to a mean-zero Gaussian with variance $T\vartheta$, it is sufficient to prove that $\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k)$ converges pointwise to $e^{-\frac{T\vartheta}{2}k^2}$. The characteristic function $\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k)$ is equal to the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k) :=& \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\mu_{\lambda,T}(x)\, e^{\mathrm{i}kx} \\
=& \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx D_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(x)\, e^{\mathrm{i}ux} \\
=& \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} e^{\mathrm{i}uX}\big] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \, \big\langle p \big| \rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \big| p + \hbar u \big\rangle \\
=& \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp [\rho_{\lambda, \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}(p),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where $u := \lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}k$. Without the formal computation with the kernel $\langle p_1|\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}|p_2\rangle$ above, the expression on the fourth line of (2.4) is equal to the first expression on the third line by Part (2) of Prop. 3.4. Since $|u| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ for small enough λ, the results of Lem. 2.1, Thm. 2.2, and Lem. 2.3 yield that the telescoping differences

$$\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(u)} - \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(u)}_Q, \qquad \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(u)}_Q - \Phi^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big[\check{\rho}_\lambda\big]^{(u)}_Q, \qquad \Phi^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big[\check{\rho}_\lambda\big]^{(u)}_Q - \mathcal{P}^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}$$

decay in the L^1-norm on the order $O(\lambda^\iota)$ for small enough choice of exponent $\iota > 0$. Thus,

$$\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}(p) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\mathcal{P}^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(p)\Big| = O(\lambda^\iota).$$

Finally, by Thm. 2.4 there is convergence as $\lambda \to 0$ for each $k \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\mathcal{P}^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dxdp\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(x,p)e^{\mathrm{i}xu} \longrightarrow e^{-\frac{T\vartheta}{2}k^2}.$$

$\square$

2.2 The ballistic cases

It is natural to apply different techniques to prove Thm. 1.3 for the cases in which either the Dirac comb or the noise is set to zero. The scenario without the comb is mathematically trivial since the dynamics has a well-known closed form when viewed through the quantum characteristic function representation; see Lem. 2.5. When only the Dirac comb is present, the proof follows by a reduction of the strategy applied in the proof of Thm. 1.2.

For $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, define the maps $U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}, \widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ to act as multiplication by the functions

$$U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}(p) := e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}\big(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\big)} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}(p) := e^{\mathrm{i}t\frac{pk}{M}}. \tag{2.5}$$

The following lemma holds for a more general class of quantum dynamical semigroups [14] satisfying a symmetry known as *Galilean covariance.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\rho_{\lambda,t}$ satisfy the Lindblad equation (1.2) with $\alpha = 0$ and beginning from a density matrix $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$. The quantum characteristic function for $\rho_{\lambda,t}$ has the closed form*

$$\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{\lambda,t}e^{\mathrm{i}uX+\mathrm{i}qP}\big] = e^{\int_0^t dr\big(\widehat{\varphi}(q+\frac{u}{M}(t-r))-\widehat{\varphi}(0)\big)}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}uX+\mathrm{i}(q+\frac{u}{M}t)P}\big],$$

where $\widehat{\varphi}(q) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dvj(v)e^{\mathrm{i}qv}$.

Proof of Thm. 1.3. Let $u := \lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}k$ and denote the characteristic function for the measure $\mu_{\lambda,T}$ by $\varphi_{\lambda,T}$. By the proof of Thm. 1.2, the function $\varphi_{\lambda,T}$ can be written in the forms

$$\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k) = \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}e^{\mathrm{i}uX}\big] \tag{2.6}$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}(p). \tag{2.7}$$

The cases without the Dirac comb and without the noise are handled in (i) and (ii) below. It is sufficient in each case to show the pointwise convergence of $\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k)$ to the value $e^{\mathrm{i}T\frac{\mathbf{p}_0 k}{M_0}}$.

(i). By (2.6) and the formula for the quantum characteristic function from Lem. 2.5, I have the first equality below:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k) =& e^{\int_0^{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} dr \big(\widehat{\varphi}(\frac{u}{M}(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}-r))-\widehat{\varphi}(0)\big)}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\check{\rho} e^{\mathrm{i}uX+\mathrm{i}\frac{uT}{M\lambda^\gamma}P}\big] \\ \approx& \mathrm{Tr}\big[\check{\rho} e^{\mathrm{i}uX+\mathrm{i}\frac{uT}{M\lambda^\gamma}P}\big] \\ =& e^{\mathrm{i}T\frac{\mathbf{p}_0 k}{M_0}} e^{-\frac{b^2u^2}{2}-\frac{\hbar^2u^2T^2}{8b^2M^2\lambda^{2\gamma}}} \approx e^{\mathrm{i}T\frac{\mathbf{p}_0 k}{M_0}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

The Fourier transform $\widehat{\varphi}$ of $j:\mathbb{R}\rightarrow\mathbb{R}_+$ has second derivative bounded by $\sigma=\int_{\mathbb{R}}dvv^2j(v)$, and the first approximation follows since $\frac{u}{M}\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}=\frac{kT}{M_0}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\ll\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The second equality is a consequence of the Gaussian form for the density matrix $\check{\rho}$.

(ii). By (2.7) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\varphi_{\lambda,T}(k)-\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\widetilde{U}^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(p)[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(u)}(p)\Big| \leq& \Big\|[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}-[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}_Q\Big\|_1 \\ &+\Big\|[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}_Q-\widetilde{U}^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(u)}\Big\|_1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The difference $[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}-[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(u)}_Q$ converges to zero in the L^1-norm as $\lambda\rightarrow 0$ by Lem. 2.1. The density matrix evolved to time $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$ is given by $\rho_{\lambda,t}=e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}\check{\rho}_\lambda e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}$ and consequently $[\rho_{\lambda,t}]^{(k')}_Q=U^{(k')}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k')}_Q$ for $k'\in\mathbb{R}$. A simplified version of the proof for Lem. 2.3 shows that there is a $C>0$ such that for all $\lambda<1$, $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$, and $|k'|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$,

$$\Big\|U^{(k')}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k')}_Q-\widetilde{U}^{(k')}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k')}\Big\|_1\leq C\big(\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}}+\mathcal{R}t\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\big). \tag{2.10}$$

Since $\gamma<\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}$, the terms on the right side of (2.9) converge to zero for small λ. However, $[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(u)}(p)$ is equal to $\big(\frac{2b^2}{\pi\hbar^2}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{b^2u^2}{2}}e^{-\frac{2b^2}{\hbar^2}(p-\mathbf{p})^2}$, which gives that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\widetilde{U}^{(u)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(p)[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(u)}(p)=e^{\mathrm{i}T\frac{k\mathbf{p}_0}{M_0}}e^{-\frac{b^2u^2}{2}-\frac{\hbar^2u^2T^2}{8b^2M^2\lambda^{2\gamma}}}\approx e^{\mathrm{i}T\frac{\mathbf{p}_0 k}{M_0}}.$$

□

3 Bloch functions and the fiber decompositions

3.1 Fiber decomposition for the Hamiltonian

The invariance of the Hamiltonian H under spatial shifts by $a\in\mathbb{R}_+$ is characterized by the commutation relation

$$e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P}H=He^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P}. \tag{3.1}$$

It follows that H acts invariantly on the eigenspaces of $e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P}$, which is the foundation for Bloch theory [22]. The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}=L^2(\mathbb{R})$ has a canonical tensor product decomposition $\mathcal{H}=L^2(\mathbb{T})\otimes L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ in which an element $f\in\mathcal{H}$ is related to an L^2-function $\widehat{f}:\mathbb{T}\rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ through the partial Fourier transform

$$\widehat{f}_\phi(x)=\big(\frac{a}{2\pi\hbar}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}\phi n}f(x+an), \qquad x\in\mathcal{I}_a,$$

where the argument $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ of $\widehat{f}$ is placed as a subscript. The commutation relation (3.1) implies that there are self-adjoint operators H_ϕ, $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ defined on dense domains of $L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ such that $(\widehat{Hf})_\phi = H_\phi \widehat{f}_\phi$. The operators H_ϕ have the form

$$H_\phi = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\Big(\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Big)^{(\alpha)}_\phi,$$

where $\big(\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\big)^{(\alpha)}_\phi$ is the self-adjoint extension of the second derivative over the domain $(-\frac{a}{2}, 0) \cup (0, \frac{a}{2})$ with the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2M\alpha}{\hbar^2} g(0) &= \frac{dg}{dx}(0+) - \frac{dg}{dx}(0-), \\ g\big(-\frac{a}{2}\big) &= e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}\phi} g\big(\frac{a}{2}\big), \\ \frac{dg}{dx}\big(-\frac{a}{2}\big) &= e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}\phi}\frac{dg}{dx}\big(\frac{a}{2}\big). \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Bloch functions

The eigenfunctions for the operators H_ϕ, $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ have closed forms in the case of the Dirac comb, which are Bloch functions $\widetilde{\psi}_p \in L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ for $p = \phi + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$\widetilde{\psi}_p(x) = N_p^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{cases} \frac{e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)-p)}-1}{e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)}-1} e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)} + e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)-p)} e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)} & -\frac{a}{2} \leq x \leq 0, \\ \\ \frac{e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)-p)}-1}{1-e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)} + e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)} & 0 \leq x < \frac{a}{2}, \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

where $N_p > 0$ is a normalization, and $\mathbf{q} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined in the Krönig-Penney relation (1.5). I denote the Bloch functions for the momentum operator by $\psi_p := a^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}p}$. For $|p| \gg \frac{\alpha M}{\hbar}$, then $\frac{a}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p) \approx \frac{a}{\hbar}p$, and the Bloch function $\widetilde{\psi}_p$ is approximately equal to ψ_p except for p near an element of the lattice $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$ (see Lem. 3.1 below). Under the usual conventions, the eigenvalues $E_{N,\phi}$ and corresponding eigenvectors $\widetilde{\psi}_{N,\phi}$ for the Hamiltonian H_ϕ are labeled progressively $E_{N+1,\phi} \geq E_{N,\phi}$ by the *band index* $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and the *quasimomentum* $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$. For $\phi \neq -\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}, 0$, the extended-zone scheme parameter $p \in \mathbb{R}$ is determined by the pair N, ϕ through the relations

$$p = \phi \operatorname{mod} \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad N = \begin{cases} \frac{a}{\pi\hbar}|p-\phi| & S(p) = S(\phi), \\ \\ \frac{a}{\pi\hbar}|p-\phi| - 1 & S(p) = -S(\phi), \end{cases}$$

where $S : \mathbb{R} \to \{\pm 1\}$ is the sign function. The assignment convention for the measure zero set $\phi \in \{-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}, 0\}$ is not important for the purpose of this article.

Let $\Theta : \mathbb{R} \to [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ and $\mathbf{n} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Z}$ be defined such that

$$\Theta(p) = p \operatorname{mod} \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}, \qquad \mathbf{n}(p) = \frac{a}{\pi\hbar}\big(p - \Theta(p)\big). \tag{3.3}$$

Also, define $\beta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\beta(p) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{n}(p)\Theta(p)$. Lemma 3.1 bounds the difference between the Bloch functions $\widetilde{\psi}_p$, ψ_p, and the proof is contained in the proof of [6, Lem.4.1].

Lemma 3.1. *There is a $C > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < 1$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\big\|\psi_p - \widetilde{\psi}_p\big\|_2 \leq \frac{C}{1 + \big|\frac{a}{\hbar}\beta(p)\big|}.$$

3.3 Dissecting a density matrix

There are various substructures for a density matrix $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ that are useful to identify and define rigorously. Recall that an element $f \in \mathcal{H}$ can be identified with an element $\widehat{f} \in L^2\big(\mathbb{T}, L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ through the tensor product decomposition $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{T}) \otimes L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$. For an Hilbert-Schmidt operator $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_2(\mathcal{H})$, there are operator coefficients $\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho) \in \mathcal{B}_2\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ defined a.e. $(\phi, \kappa) \in \mathbb{T} \times [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ through the relation

$$\langle f|\rho g\rangle = \hbar \int_{\mathbb{T}\times[-\frac{\pi}{a},\frac{\pi}{a})} d\phi d\kappa \big\langle \widehat{f}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big|\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)\widehat{g}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big\rangle \tag{3.4}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$. The operators $\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho) : L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ are merely the blocks associated with the Hilbert space tensor product $L^2(\mathbb{T})\otimes L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ with a parameter rescaling in the off-diagonal direction by $\hbar^{-1}$. When ρ is trace class, the operator coefficients $\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)$ can be taken to be in $\mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ and are determined in a stricter sense than a.e. $(\phi, \kappa) \in \mathbb{T} \times [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$: For each $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$, the operators $\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho) \in \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ are defined a.e. $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$. In fact, for all $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$, the function $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)$ that sends $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ to $\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)$ can be regarded as an element in $L^1\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}_1(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$.

The function $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho) : \mathbb{T} \to \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ is defined in the lemma below though the Banach algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of operators that commute with $e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P}$. The algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is isometrically isomorphic to $L^\infty\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$. Elements $G \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$ are identified with elements $\widetilde{G} \in L^\infty\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$ through the equality

$$\langle f|Gg\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \big\langle \widehat{f}_{\phi}\big|\widetilde{G}_{\phi}\, \widehat{g}_{\phi}\big\rangle, \qquad\qquad f, g \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$. There is a unique function $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho) \in L^1\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)\big)$ satisfying that for all $G \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$,*

$$\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X} G e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}\big] = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho) e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \widetilde{G}_{\phi} e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big],$$

where $X_{\mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{B}\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ acts as the multiplication operator $(X_{\mathbb{T}}f) = xf(x)$ for $f \in L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$. Moreover, the norm for $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)$ has the bound $\big\|\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big\|_1 \leq \|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}$.

Recall that $[\rho]^{(k)}_Q$ and $[\rho]^{(k)}$ are formally defined to be functions of $p \in \mathbb{R}$ given by ${}_Q\langle p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}|\rho|p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}\rangle_Q$ and $\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2}|\rho|p + \frac{\hbar k}{2}\rangle$, respectively. I interpret the mathematical definitions for expressions involving kets as referring to analogous expressions formulated in terms of Bloch functions and the tensor product decomposition $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{T}) \otimes L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$; for instance,

$$\begin{aligned} {}_Q\big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big|\rho\big|\, p + \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big\rangle_Q &:= \big\langle \widetilde{\psi}_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big|\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)\big|\widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big\rangle \quad \text{and} \\ \big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big|\rho\big|\, p + \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big\rangle &:= \big\langle \psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big|\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)\big|\psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for $\phi, \hbar\kappa \in \mathbb{T}$ equal respectively to $p, \hbar k \in \mathbb{R}$ modulo $\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$. Finally, I also define $\langle\rho\rangle^{(\kappa)} \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ for $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\langle\rho\rangle^{(\kappa)}_{\phi} := \mathrm{Tr}[\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)]$. In future, the expressions $\ell^{(k)}_{p}(\rho)$ and $\langle\rho\rangle^{(k)}_{p}$ for $k, p \in \mathbb{R}$ should be understood as $\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho)$ and $\langle\rho\rangle^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}$ for k, p related to κ, ϕ as before.

The inequalities in Prop. 3.3 and 3.4 are all consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, and define $|\rho| := \sqrt{\rho^*\rho}$ and $|\rho|_* := \sqrt{\rho\rho_*}$.*

1. *Let $f_\phi, g_\phi \in L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ be square integrable functions of the parameter $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$. For each $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$, the following inequality holds for a.e. $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$:*

$$\big|\big\langle f_\phi\big|\ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}(\rho) g_\phi\big\rangle\big| \leq \big\langle f_\phi\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(|\rho|_*\big) f_\phi\big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\langle g_\phi\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(|\rho|\big) g_\phi\big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.5}$$

2. *For any* $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ *and a.e.* $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\big|\langle \rho \rangle_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}\big| \leq \big(\langle |\rho_*| \rangle_{\phi - \frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}^{(0)}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \big(\langle |\rho| \rangle_{\phi + \frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}^{(0)}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

3. *For any* $k \in \mathbb{R}$ *and a.e.* $p \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\big|[\rho]^{(k)}(p)\big| \leq \Big(\big[|\rho_*|\big]^{(0)}\big(p - \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\big[|\rho|\big]^{(0)}\big(p + \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The analogous equality holds with the $[\rho]^{(k)}$*'s replaced by* $[\rho]_Q^{(k)}$*'s.*

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$.

1. *The following equalities hold:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp [\rho]_Q^{(0)}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp [\rho]^{(0)}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \langle \rho \rangle_{\phi}^{(0)} = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho].$$

2. *For any* $k \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}kX}\big] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp [\rho]^{(k)}(p).$$

3. *For any* $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\big\|\langle \rho \rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_1, \big\|[\rho]^{(k)}\big\|_1, \big\|[\rho]_Q^{(k)}\big\|_1 \leq \|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}.$$

3.4 Fiber decomposition for the Lindblad dynamics

Since the Hamiltonian is spatially periodic and the noise (1.3) is invariant under all spatial shifts, the Lindblad dynamics (1.2) is invariant under shifts by the period a of the Dirac comb. In terms of the dynamical semigroup $\Phi_{\lambda,t} : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, the spatial symmetry translates to the covariance:

$$\Phi_{\lambda,t}\big(e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P} \rho e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P}\big) = e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P} \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho) e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}P}, \qquad \rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H}).$$

As a consequence, the dynamics decomposes into fibers as stated in Part (1) of Prop. 3.5. To be mathematically rigorous, the differential equation in Part (1) of Prop. 3.5 should be phrased as an integral equation and evaluated against an appropriate class of test functions. The constant $\varpi > 0$ in Parts (3) and (4) of the proposition below is from the jump rate assumptions in List 1.1.

Proposition 3.5.

1. *For each* $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$, *the functions* $\ell^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) \in L^1\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}_1(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$ *satisfy the differential equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) = &-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar}\Big(H_{\phi - \frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}} \ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) - \ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) H_{\phi + \frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\Big) - \mathcal{R}\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi' \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} j(\phi - \phi' + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n) e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{\hbar}(\phi - \phi' + \frac{2\pi\hbar n}{a})X} \ell_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{\hbar}(\phi - \phi' + \frac{2\pi\hbar n}{a})X}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, there is a contractive semigroup $\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(\kappa)} : L^1\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}_1(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$ *such that for all* $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(\kappa)}\big(\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big) = \ell^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big).$$

2. *For all* $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ *and* $\lambda > 0$*, the functions* $\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho) \rangle^{(\kappa)} \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ *satisfy the Kolmogorov equation*
$$\frac{d}{dt}\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle_{\phi}^{(\kappa)} = -\mathcal{R}\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle_{\phi}^{(\kappa)} + \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi' J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi,\phi')\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)},$$
where $J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi,\phi') := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} j(\phi - \phi' + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)$*.*

3. *For all* $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ *and* $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$*, the following inequality holds:* $\big\|\big\langle \Psi(\rho)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_\infty \leq \varpi \|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}$*.*

4. *For all* $\lambda > 0$*,* $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$*,* $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$*, and* $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$*,*
$$\big\|\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_\infty \leq e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\big\|\langle \rho\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_\infty + \frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}.$$

4 Energy submartingales and unravelments of the dynamical maps

4.1 Pseudo-Poisson and Lévy unravelments

As mentioned in Sect. 1.1, the map $\Psi : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ generating the noise for the quantum dynamical semigroup $\Phi_{\lambda,t} : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ satisfies $\Psi^*(I) = \mathcal{R}I$. This should be interpreted as meaning that the escape rates for the quantum Markovian process are invariant of the state. This property, referred to as *pseudo-Poisson* for classical processes, implies that the dynamical maps $\Phi_{\lambda,t}$ can be unraveled in terms of an underlying Poisson process with rate $\mathcal{R}$. For each k, the semigroups $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ also have the pseudo-Poisson property. The proof of Part (1) from Lem. 4.1 is contained in [6, Appx.A], and the proof of Part (2) is similar.

Define the transition operator $T_{\lambda}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ to have kernel $\mathcal{R}^{-1}J_{\lambda,k}(p,p')$ for $J_{\lambda,k}$ defined in (2.2) and recall that $U_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ acts as multiplication by the function $U_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}(p) = e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}\left(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}) - E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\right)}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $\mathbb{E}$ *denote the expectation with respect to a rate-*$\mathcal{R}$ *Poisson process* $\mathcal{N} \equiv \mathcal{N}_t(\xi)$ *with realizations* $\xi = (t_1, t_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\infty}$*,* $t_j \leq t_{j+1}$*.*

1. *The map* $\Phi_{\lambda,t} : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ *can be written as* $\Phi_{\lambda,t} = \mathbb{E}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}\big]$*, where*
$$\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}(\rho) := \mathcal{R}^{-\mathcal{N}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t-t_{\mathcal{N}}}{\hbar}H}\Psi(\cdots e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t_2-t_1}{\hbar}H}\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t_1}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t_1}{\hbar}H})e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t_2-t_1}{\hbar}H}\cdots)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t-t_{\mathcal{N}}}{\hbar}H}.$$

2. *Similarly, the map* $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ *can be written as* $\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}^{(k)}\big]$*, where*
$$\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}^{(k)}(\rho) := U_{\lambda,t-t_{\mathcal{N}}}^{(k)} T_{\lambda}^{(k)} \cdots U_{\lambda,t_2-t_1}^{(k)} T_{\lambda}^{(k)} U_{\lambda,t_1}^{(k)}.$$

The semigroup $\Phi_{\lambda,t}$ has an even more restrictive property than being pseudo-Poisson, since the noise map Ψ has a Kraus decomposition (1.3) comprised of an integral combination of unitary conjugations. This allows the maps $\Phi_{\lambda,t}$ to be written as convex combinations of unitary conjugations using an underlying Lévy process with jump rate density $j(v)$. Given an element $\xi = (v_1, t_1; v_2, t_2; \dots) \in (\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+)^\infty$ with $t_j \leq t_{j+1}$, the unitary operator $U_{\lambda,t}(\xi) : \mathcal{H}$ is defined by the product
$$U_{\lambda,t}(\xi) := e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{(t-t_n)}{\hbar}H} e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v_n}{\hbar}X} \cdots e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{(t_2-t_1)}{\hbar}H} e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v_1}{\hbar}X} e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t_1}{\hbar}H}. \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.2 is from [6, Appx.A].

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $\xi = (v_1, t_1; v_2, t_2; \dots) \in (\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+)^\infty$ *be the realization for a Lévy process with jump rate density* $j(v)$*. The dynamical maps* $\Phi_{\lambda,t}$ *can be written as*
$$\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}\Big[U_{\lambda,t}(\xi)\,\rho\,U_{\lambda,t}^*(\xi)\Big], \tag{4.2}$$
where the expectation is with respect to the law of the Lévy process.

4.2 Energy submartingales

Parts (1) and (2) of the proposition below are energy submartingale properties from [6, Prop.5.1]. Part (3) follows by a similar argument as Part (2). As stated in Prop. 9.10, Parts (1) and (2) carry over to analogous properties for the classical stochastic process K_t discussed in Sect. 1.2.4.

Proposition 4.3. *Let the unitary process* $U_{\lambda,t}(\xi) \in \mathcal{B}\big(L^2(\mathcal{H})\big)$ *be defined as in (4.1) for times* $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ *and a realization* $\xi \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+)^\infty$ *of a Lévy process with rate density* $j(v)$*.*

1. *For every* $f \in \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{H})$*, the stochastic process* $\big\langle U_{\lambda,t}(\xi)f \,\big|\, H^{\frac{1}{2}} U_{\lambda,t}(\xi) f\big\rangle$ *is an integrable submartingale with respect to the filtration of the Lévy process.*
2. *The evaluation of the Hamiltonian by the Heisenberg evolution maps* $\Phi^*_{\lambda,t}$ *has the explicit form:*
$$\Phi^*_{\lambda,t}(H) = H + \frac{\sigma t}{2M} I.$$
3. *A similar formula holds for each map* Φ^*_{λ,ξ,t_n} *when acting on the Hamiltonian:*
$$\Phi^*_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(H) = H + \frac{\sigma n}{2\mathcal{R}M} I.$$

5 From the momentum to the extended-zone scheme representation

In this section, I focus on proving Lem. 2.1. Lemma 5.1 states that the extend-zone scheme momentum for the state $\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is concentrated "near" the values $\pm\mathbf{p}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ *and* $\iota \in (0, \frac{1-\gamma}{2})$*. For fixed* $T > 0$*, there is a* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $\lambda < 1$*,*
$$\int_{||p|-\mathbf{p}|\geq \lambda^\iota \mathbf{p}} \Big| \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}_{Q}(p) \Big| \leq C \lambda^{1-\gamma-2\iota}.$$

The main ingredient for the proof of Lem. 2.1 is the bound for the difference between the Bloch functions ψ_p and $\widetilde{\psi}_p$ for $|p| \gg \frac{\hbar}{a}$ in Lem. 3.1. Lemma 5.1 guarantees that the relevant $p \in \mathbb{R}$ for the Lem. 2.1 estimates are sufficiently large. The upper bound of Lem. 5.1 is weak for p close to elements in $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$, and I apply Part (4) of Prop. 3.5 to ensure that the momentum densities are bounded when contracted to the torus $\mathbb{T}$, and thus are not concentrated in the troublesome region around the lattice. Other elements in the proof are the Cauchy-Schwarz-type inequalities of Sect. 3.3.

Proof of Lem. 2.1. By adding and subtracting $\big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \big| \rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \big\rangle_Q$ and using the triangle inequality, I have the bound

$$\Big\| \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(k)} - \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(k)}_Q \Big\|_1 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \, \Big| \Big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big| \rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \Big(\Big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big\rangle - \Big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big\rangle_Q \Big) \Big|$$
$$+ \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \, \Big| \Big(\Big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big| - {}_Q\Big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big| \Big) \rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \Big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big\rangle_Q \Big|. \tag{5.1}$$

The terms on the right side of (5.1) are similar, so I will treat only the first. For $\phi \in \mathbb{T}, \kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ with $\phi = p \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $\kappa = k \bmod \frac{2\pi}{a}$, translating from ket notation to Bloch functions yields

$$\Big\langle p - \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big| \rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \Big(\Big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big\rangle - \Big| p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} \Big\rangle_Q \Big) = \Big\langle \psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big) \Big(\psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big) \Big\rangle.$$

The first term on the right side of (5.1) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \Big| \Big\langle \psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(\kappa)}_{\phi}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\Big(\psi_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\Big)\Big\rangle\Big| & \\
\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \Big\langle \psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\Big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\langle \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\Big| \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\Big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} & \\
\leq \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \Big\langle \psi_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\Big| \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\Big\rangle\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. & \qquad (5.2)
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above is by Part (1) of Prop. 3.3, and the second inequality uses Cauchy-Schwarz along with Part (1) of Prop. 3.4 to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \Big\langle \psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\Big| \psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\Big\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big]^{(0)}\big(p - \frac{\hbar k}{2}\big) = \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big] = 1.$$

To bound the bottom line of (5.2), I will treat the integrand separately for the domains $|p| \in [\mathbf{p} - 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p} + 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}]$ and $|p| \notin [\mathbf{p} - 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p} + 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}]$ in (i) and (ii) below.

(i). For the domain $|p| \in [\mathbf{p} - 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p} + 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\int_{|p|\in[\mathbf{p}-2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}]} \Big\langle \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\Big| \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\Big\rangle\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \\
\leq \Big(\sup_{\phi\in\mathbb{T}} \big\| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\big\|_{\infty}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\frac{4\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}a}{\pi\hbar} \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \sup_{\substack{p=\phi \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}, \\ |p|\geq\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}}} \big\| \psi_p - \widetilde{\psi}_p \big\|_2^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \qquad (5.3)
\end{aligned}$$

where I have bounded the number of $p \in [\mathbf{p} - 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p} + 2\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}]$ with $p + \frac{\hbar k}{2} = \phi \bmod \frac{2\pi a}{\hbar}$ for a fixed $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ by $\frac{4\mathbf{p}\lambda^{\iota}a}{\pi\hbar}$. The left term on the second line of (5.3) is bounded independently of $T, \lambda > 0$, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\phi\in\mathbb{T}} \big\| \ell^{(0)}_{\phi}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\big\| \leq \sup_{\phi\in\mathbb{T}} \mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell^{(0)}_{\phi}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big)\big] &\leq \sup_{\phi\in\mathbb{T}} \langle \check{\rho}_{\lambda}\rangle^{(0)}_{\phi} + \frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}} \\
&\leq \big(\frac{2b_0^2}{\pi\hbar_0^2}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{\phi\in\mathbb{T}} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-\frac{2b_0^2(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0})^2}{\hbar_0^2}} + \frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}}, \qquad (5.4)
\end{aligned}$$

where second inequality is by Part (4) of Prop. 3.5. The right term on the second line of (5.3) is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}a}{\pi\hbar} \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \sup_{\substack{p=\phi \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}, \\ |p|\geq\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}}} \big\| \psi_p - \widetilde{\psi}_p \big\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{8\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}a}{\pi\hbar} \int_{[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a},\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}]} d\theta \frac{C}{(1 + |\frac{1}{4}\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{\pi\hbar}\frac{a\theta}{\pi\hbar}|)^2} \\
&\leq C\lambda^{\iota}\frac{32\pi\hbar}{a} \int_{[-\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{8\pi\hbar},\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{8\pi\hbar}]} dy \frac{1}{(1+|y|)^2} \qquad (5.5) \\
&\leq C\lambda^{\iota}\frac{64\pi\hbar}{a}, \qquad (5.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is for some $C > 0$ by Lem. 3.1. The inequalities (5.4) and (5.5) give that the right side of (5.3) is $O(\lambda^{\iota})$.

(ii). Notice that the above analysis implies

$$\int_{|p|\in[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+\lambda^{\iota}\mathbf{p}]} \Big| \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big]^{(0)}(p) - \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big]^{(0)}_{Q}(p)\Big| = O(\lambda^{\iota}).$$

Moreover, since $\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]_Q^{(0)}(p) = 1$ by Part (1) of Prop. 3.4,

$$\int_{|p|\notin[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}]} \Big|\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}(p) - \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]_Q^{(0)}(p)\Big| = O(\lambda^\iota). \tag{5.7}$$

For the integration over the domain $|p| \notin [\mathbf{p} - 2\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p} + 2\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}]$, I have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|p|\notin[\mathbf{p}-2\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+2\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}]} \Big\langle \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell_\phi^{(0)}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big) \Big| \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} - \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big\rangle \\
&\leq 2\int_{|p|\notin[\mathbf{p}-2\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+2\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}]} \Big(\Big\langle \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell_\phi^{(0)}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big) \Big| \psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big\rangle + \Big\langle \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big| \ell_\phi^{(0)}\big(\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big) \Big| \widetilde{\psi}_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}} \Big\rangle \Big) \\
&\leq 2\int_{|p|\notin[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}]} \Big(\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}(p) + \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]_Q^{(0)}(p) \Big) \\
&\leq 4\int_{|p|\notin[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}+\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}]} \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]_Q^{(0)}(p) + O(\lambda^\iota) \\
&\leq C'\lambda^{1-\gamma-2\iota} + O(\lambda^\iota) = O(\lambda^\iota).
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the definitions of $[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]^{(0)}$, $[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}]_Q^{(0)}$ and the assumption $|k| \leq \frac{\lambda^\iota\mathbf{p}}{\hbar}$. The third inequality follows from (5.7), and the last inequality holds for some $C' > 0$ by Lem. 5.1. Finally, the order equality uses that $\iota = 1 - \gamma - 2\iota$.

$\square$

6 The quantum Freidlin-Wentzell limit

In this section, I prove Thm. 2.2. The analysis of for the proof of Thm. 2.2 is an extension of the analysis for the proof of [6, Thm.2.1]. The previous result only characterized the limiting autonomous dynamics for the diagonals of the time-evolved density matrices in the extended-zone scheme representation, whereas the treatment here includes a region of off-diagonals.

Recall from Sect. 4 that the operator $T_\lambda^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is defined to have kernel $\mathcal{R}^{-1}J_{\lambda,k}(p,p')$ and $U_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ acts as multiplication by the function $U_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}(p) = e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}\left(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\right)}$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be positive. There is a $C > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < 1$, $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$, and $s_1 \leq s_2$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\| \int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \Big(\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)} - U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}T_\lambda^{(k)}U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)}[\rho]_Q^{(k)} \Big) \Big\|_1 \\
&\qquad \leq C(s_2 - s_1)\Big(\lambda^{2+\varrho}\frac{Ma^2}{\hbar^2}\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho] + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\|\langle\rho\rangle^{(0)}\|_\infty + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}} \Big) + C\mathcal{R}^{-1}\lambda^\varrho\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is similar to Part (4) of Prop. 3.5.

Lemma 6.2. *Let the maps $\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}$ and the times t_n be defined as in Lem. 4.1. The following inequality holds:*

$$\big\|\big\langle\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_\infty \leq \delta_{0,n}\big\|\langle\rho\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_\infty + (1-\delta_{0,n})\frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}}.$$

The proof of Thm. 2.2 follows closely from Lem. 6.1 after unraveling the maps $\Phi_{\lambda,t} : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ through the pseudo-Poisson representation of Sect. 4.1 and introducing a telescoping sum of intermediary dynamics that evolve according to the original dynamics up to the nth Poisson time and the idealized dynamics afterwards. There is technical detail in the application of Lem. 6.2 resulting from the presence of the factor $\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho]$ in the upper bound, since $\mathrm{Tr}[H\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(\check{\rho})]$ increases linearly with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by Part (3) of Lem. 4.3. This small problem is resolved by considering a suitable time cut-off that avoids unmanageable energy grow and by bounding the remainder through a simpler estimate.

Proof of Thm. 2.2. For $\mathcal{N}$ and ξ defined as in Lem. 4.1 and $0 \leq r \leq t$, define

$$\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t} := U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t-t_{\mathcal{N}}} T^{(k)}_{\lambda} \cdots U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_{n+1}-t_n} T^{(k)}_{\lambda} U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_n-r},$$

where t_n is the first Poisson time $> r$. By Lem. 4.1, I have the first equality below:

$$\begin{aligned}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{\mathcal{N}_t(\xi)} \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n,t}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1},t}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q\Big],\end{aligned}$$

For the second equality, I have inserted terms $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n,t}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q$ in the form of a telescoping sum. The difference between $\big[\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q$ and $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q$ at time $t = \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}$ is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1 \leq 2e^{-\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \sum_{\mathcal{N}=\lfloor\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda}\rfloor+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}!}\big(\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}} \\ &\quad + e^{-\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \sum_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda}\rfloor} \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \Big\|\int_{0\leq t_1\cdots\leq t_{\mathcal{N}}\leq\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1},\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1.\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

In the above, I have applied the triangle inequality to the telescoping sums for the first $\lfloor\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda}\rfloor$ terms. For the remaining terms, I have used that $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t}$ is contractive in the 1-norm, $\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t}$ is contractive in the trace norm, and $\|[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\|_1 \leq \|\check{\rho}_\lambda\|_{\mathbf{1}} = 1$. The first term on the second line of (6.1) decays superpolynomially as λ goes to zero.

A single term from the sum on the second line of (6.1) is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\int_{0\leq t_1\cdots\leq t_{\mathcal{N}}\leq\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q - \Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1},\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1 \\ &\leq \int_{0\leq t_1\cdots\leq t_{n-1}\leq t_{n+1}\leq\cdots t_{\mathcal{N}}\leq\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}} \Big\|\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_{n+1}} dt_n\Big(\mathcal{R}^{-1}U^{(k)}_{\lambda,-t_n+t_{n-1}}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t_n-t_{n-1}}{\hbar}H}\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t_n-t_{n-1}}{\hbar}H})\big]^{(k)}_Q \\ &\quad - U^{(k)}_{\lambda,-t_n+t_{n-1}}T^{(k)}_\lambda U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_n-t_{n-1}}[\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)]^{(k)}_Q\Big)\Big\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\mathcal{N}!}\big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}}\Big(\lambda^{2+\varrho}\frac{Ma^2}{\hbar^2}\mathrm{Tr}\big[H\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big] + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\big\|\big\langle\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big\rangle^{(0)}\big\|_\infty + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\Big) + \frac{C\mathcal{R}^{-1}\lambda^\varrho}{(\mathcal{N}-1)!}\big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}-1} \\ &\leq \frac{C'\lambda^{1+\varrho}}{\mathcal{N}!}\big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}} + \frac{C\mathcal{R}^{-1}\lambda^\varrho}{(\mathcal{N}-1)!}\big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}-1}\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

for some constants $C, C' > 0$, where I identify $t_0 \equiv 0$ and $t_{\mathcal{N}+1} \equiv \frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}$ for the boundary terms on the second line. The first inequality above uses that $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t}$ and $U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$ are contractive in the 1-norm. The second inequality in (6.2) is by Lem. 6.1 and $\|\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\|_{\mathbf{1}} \leq 1$. The first term of the fourth line can be bounded by an application of Part (3) from Lem. 4.3 to get

$$\sup_{0\leq n\leq\frac{T\mathcal{R}}{\lambda}} \frac{\lambda Ma^2}{\hbar^2}\mathrm{Tr}\big[H\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\big] \leq \frac{M_0a_0^2}{\hbar_0^2}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\big[H\check{\rho}_\lambda\big] + \frac{\sigma T}{2M_0}\Big) = O(\lambda^0).$$

The expression $\|\langle \Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n-1}}(\check{\rho}_\lambda)\rangle^{(0)}\|_\infty$ from the second term of the fourth line of (6.2) is $O(\lambda^0)$ by Lem. 6.2 and Part (3) of Prop. 3.4.

With the result (6.2), the second line of (6.1) is smaller than

$$e^{-\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\sum_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{\lfloor\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda}\rfloor}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{N}}\Big(\frac{C'\lambda^{1+\varrho}}{\mathcal{N}!}\big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}}+\frac{C\lambda^{\varrho}}{(\mathcal{N}-1)!}\big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}\big)^{\mathcal{N}-1}\Big)\leq C'\mathcal{R}T\lambda^{1+\varrho-\gamma}+C(1+\mathcal{R}T)\lambda^{\varrho-\gamma},$$

To obtain the above inequality, I have replaced the upper bound $\lfloor\frac{\mathcal{R}T}{\lambda}\rfloor$ by infinity and applied elementary manipulations to the Taylor expansion of an exponential function. Since $\varrho > \gamma > 0$, the right side tends to zero for small λ.

□

7 Convergence to the classical Markovian dynamics

This section contains the proof of Thm. 2.2. Part (1) of the lemma below essentially states that the dispersion relation $E(p)$ has derivative close to $\frac{p}{M}$, and Part (2) is related to the continuity in $p \in \mathbb{R}$ of the coefficients $\kappa_v(p,n)$. Both estimates require that the momenta involved are not too close to the lattice $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$. Recall that the function $\Theta : \mathbb{R} \to [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ contracts momenta modulo $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}$.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the set of all (p,v) satisfying $|\Theta(p)|, |\Theta(p+v)| > \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}$. There is a $C > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < 1$ and $(p,v) \in A$,*

1. $\frac{1}{\hbar}\big|E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)-E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)+\frac{p\hbar k}{M}\big| < C\mathcal{R}\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}$,
2. $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big|\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},\,n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},\,n\big)-\big|\kappa_v(p,\,n)\big|^2\Big| \leq C\big(1+\frac{a^2}{\hbar^2}v^2\big)\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}$.

The proof of Lem. 2.3 is primarily involves bounding the difference between the semigroups $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,t} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$. For this task, it is convenient to introduce an intermediary semigroup $\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,t}$ that has the same drift term as $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$ and the same jump term as $\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$. Let $\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,t} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ be the semigroup with generator $\mathcal{L}''_{\lambda,k}$ that acts on elements $f \in \mathcal{T} := \big\{f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \,\big|\, \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp|p|\,|f(p)| < \infty\big\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\mathcal{L}''_{\lambda,k}f\big)(p) = &-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar}\Big(E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)-E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)\Big)f(p)\\ &-\mathcal{R}f(p)+\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp'J(p,p')f(p'). \end{aligned}\tag{7.1}$$

The difference $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,t} - \Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,t}$ is bounded by means of a Duhamel equation and an application of Part (2) of Lem 7.1, and the difference $\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,t} - \Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$ is bounded through a pseudo-Poisson unravelment and an application of Part (1) of Lem. 7.1. Since the inequalities in Lem. 7.1 pertain to momenta bounded away from the lattice $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$, I take precautions though Parts (3) and (4) of Prop. 3.5 to ensure that momentum densities are not peaked in the region around the lattice.

Proof of Lem. 2.3. The function $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t} \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is given by $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t} = \Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}$ for the semigroup $\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$ with generator $\mathcal{L}'_{\lambda,k}$ defined in (2.3). The difference in norm between $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$ and $\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q$ for all $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$, $\lambda < 1$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is smaller than

$$\Big\|\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}-\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1 \leq \Big\|[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}-[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1 = O(\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}}),$$

where the order equality follows by the approximation techniques from the proof of Lem. 2.1. It is thus sufficient to control the difference between the operation of the contractive semigroups $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$ and $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$. For the intermediary semigroup $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k),\prime} : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ with generator (7.1), the differences $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} - \Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k),\prime}$ and $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k),\prime} - \Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$ are bounded respectively in parts (i) and (ii) below.

(i). The difference between $\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}$ and $\Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k),\prime}$ can be written in terms of the Duhamel equation

$$\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)} - \Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k),\prime} = \int_0^t dr \Phi_{\lambda,t-r}^{(k)}\big(J_\lambda^{(k)} - J\big)\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime}.$$

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be defined as in Lem. 7.1 and $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $B = \{p \in \mathbb{R} \,|\, |\theta(p)| > \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}\}$. Since $\Phi_{\lambda,t-r}^{(k)}$ is contractive in the L^1-norm, I have the first inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|\Phi_{\lambda,t}^{(k)}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)} - \Upsilon_{\lambda,t}^{(k),\prime}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 \\
&\quad \le t \sup_{0\le r\le t}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, j(v)\Big|\Big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\Big)(p)\Big|\Big|\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},\, n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},\, n\big) - \big|\kappa_v\big(p,\, n\big)\big|^2\Big| \\
&\quad \le 2t \sup_{0\le r\le t}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, 1_{A^c}(p,v) j(v)\Big|\Big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\Big)(p)\Big| \\
&\qquad + \mathcal{R}t\big(1+\frac{a^2}{\hbar^2}\frac{\sigma}{\mathcal{R}}\big)\sup_{(p,v)\in A}\frac{1}{1+\frac{a^2}{\hbar^2}v^2}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big|\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},\, n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},\, n\big) - \big|\kappa_v\big(p,\, n\big)\big|^2\Big|.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

The second inequality above partitions the integration over $(p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ into the domains A and A^c, and for the domain A^c applies the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality along with the fact that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v\big(p,\, n\big)\big|^2 \le 1$ for all $(p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For the domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, I have multiplied and divided by $1 + \frac{a^2}{\hbar^2}v^2$ and applied Holder's inequality in combination with $\|\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\|_1 \le \|[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\|_1 \le 1$. The last line of (7.2) is bounded by a constant multiple of $\mathcal{R}t\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}$ by Part (2) of Lem. 7.1. I will bound the expression on the third line of (7.2) in (I) below.

(I). For the integrand on the third line of (7.2),

$$\Big|\big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\big)(p)\Big| \le \frac{1}{2}\big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}\mathcal{S}_{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}\big)(p) + \frac{1}{2}\big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}\mathcal{S}_{-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}\big)(p), \tag{7.3}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_q : L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is the shift operator by $q \in \mathbb{R}$: $\big(\mathcal{S}_q f\big)(p) = f(p-q)$. The above inequality uses that $|(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime} f)(p)| \le (\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}|f|)(p)$ for all $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and a.e. $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and Part (3) of Prop. 3.3 to bound $[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}$ by the sum $\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{S}_{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{S}_{-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}$. With (7.3) and the bound $1_{A^c}(p,v) \le 1_{B^c}(p) + 1_{B^c}(p+v)$, I have the first inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, 1_{A^c}(p,v) j(v)\Big|\big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(k),\prime}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}\big)(p)\Big| \le & \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\, \Big(1_{B^c}(p) + 1_{B^c}(p+v)\Big) j(v) \\
& \times \Big(\big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}\mathcal{S}_{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}\big)(p) + \big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}\mathcal{S}_{-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}\big)(p)\Big) \\
\le & \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \Big(\mathcal{R}1_{B^c}(p) + \varpi\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}\Big) \\
& \times \Big(\big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}\mathcal{S}_{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}\big)(p) + \big(\Upsilon_{\lambda,r}^{(0),\prime}\mathcal{S}_{-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(0)}\big)(p)\Big) \\
\le & \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}\Big(\mathcal{R}e^{-\mathcal{R}r}\|\langle\check{\rho}_\lambda\rangle^{(0)}\|_\infty + 2\varpi\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows by assumption (2) of List 1.1. To see the third inequality above, notice that $\Upsilon^{(0),\prime}_{\lambda,r}=\Upsilon^{(0)}_{\lambda,r}$ is the Markovian semigroup with jump rate kernel J. When contracted to the torus $\mathbb{T}=[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a})$, the process is still Markovian and has kernel $J_{\mathbb{T}}$. Thus, by Part (2) of Prop. 3.5, the density $\Upsilon^{(0),\prime}_{\lambda,r}\mathcal{S}_{\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(0)}_Q$ is equal to $\big\langle\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\mathcal{S}_{\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\check{\rho}_\lambda\mathcal{S}_{\mp\frac{\hbar k}{2}})\big\rangle^{(0)}$ when contracted to the torus, and I can then apply Part (4) of Prop. 3.5 to obtain the bound.

(ii). Recall that the linear map $\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}:L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is defined as multiplication by the function $\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}(p):=e^{\mathrm{i}t\frac{pk}{M}}$. Also, let $\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t}$ and $\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t}$ be defined analogously to $\Phi^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t}$ in the proof of Thm. 2.2 as the products

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t}(\rho):=&\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t-t_{\mathcal{N}}}T^{(0)}_{\lambda}\cdots\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_{n+1}-t_n}T^{(0)}_{\lambda}\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_n-r},\\ \Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,\xi,r,t}(\rho):=&U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t-t_{\mathcal{N}}}T^{(0)}_{\lambda}\cdots U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_{n+1}-t_n}T^{(0)}_{\lambda}U^{(k)}_{\lambda,t_n-r},\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi=(t_1,t_2,\cdots)\in\mathbb{R}_+^\infty$ and $t_n\leq\cdots\leq t_{\mathcal{N}}$ are the values in the interval $(r,t]$. The difference between the maps $\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,t}$ and $\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}$ can be written in terms of a telescoping sums as

$$\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,t}-\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,t}=e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\sum_{\mathcal{N}=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{N}}\sum_{n=0}^{\mathcal{N}}\int_{0\leq t_1\cdots\leq t_N\leq t}\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n+1},t}\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_{n+1}}-\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n,t}\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n},$$

where I use the standard identifications $t_0:=0$ and $t_{\mathcal{N}+1}:=t$. By the triangle inequality, I have the first inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\Upsilon^{(k),\prime}_{\lambda,\xi,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q-\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1\leq&e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\sum_{\mathcal{N}=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{N}}\sum_{n=0}^{\mathcal{N}}\int_{0\leq t_1\cdots\leq t_N\leq t}\\&\sup_{r\in[0,t_{n+1}-t_n]}\Big\|\Big(\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,r}-U^{(k)}_{\lambda,r}\Big)\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1\\ \leq&e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\sum_{\mathcal{N}=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{N}}\sum_{n=0}^{\mathcal{N}}\int_{0\leq t_1\cdots\leq t_N\leq t}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\big(c_1+c_2\mathcal{R}(t_{n+1}-t_n)\big)\\=&\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\big(c_1+c_2\mathcal{R}t\big),\end{aligned}\tag{7.4}$$

for some $c_1,c_2>0$ determined implicitly below. The expression in the second line of (7.4) is bounded through the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{r\in[0,t_{n+1}-t_n]}\Big\|\Big(\widetilde{U}^{(k)}_{\lambda,r}-U^{(k)}_{\lambda,r}\Big)\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1\\&\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\Big|\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q(p)\Big|\sup_{r\in[0,t_{n+1}-t_n]}\Big|e^{\mathrm{i}r\frac{pk}{M}}-e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}\big(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\big)}\Big|\\&\leq2\int_{B^c}dp\Big|\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q(p)\Big|\\&\quad+\frac{t_{n+1}-t_n}{\hbar}\sup_{p\in B}\Big|E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})+\frac{pk\hbar}{M}\Big|\Big\|\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\Big\|_1\\&\leq\big(\varpi+\|\langle\check{\rho}_\lambda\rangle^{(0)}\|_\infty\big)\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\frac{2\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}+c\mathcal{R}(t_{n+1}-t_n)\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

For the second inequality above, I bounded the expression $|e^{\mathrm{i}r\frac{pk}{M}}-e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}))}|$ by 2 over the domain B^c and by $\frac{t_{n+1}-t_n}{\hbar}|E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})+\frac{pk\hbar}{M}|$ over the domain B. The third inequality uses Part (1) of Lem. 7.1 to bound the supremum in the second term for some $c > 0$, the inequality $\|\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\|_1 \leq 1$, and the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{T}}\sum_{N\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big|\Upsilon^{(k)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(k)}_Q\big(\theta+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big| &\leq \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{T}}\sum_{N\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{\pm}\Big|\Upsilon^{(0)}_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}\mathcal{S}_{\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2}}[\check{\rho}_\lambda]^{(0)}_Q\big(\theta+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\pm}\big\|\big\langle\Phi_{\lambda,\xi,t_n}\big(\mathcal{S}_{\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\check{\rho}_\lambda\mathcal{S}_{\mp\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big)\big\rangle\big\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{\pm}\|\langle\mathcal{S}_{\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\check{\rho}_\lambda\mathcal{S}_{\mp\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\rangle\|_\infty+\frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}} = \|\check{\rho}_\lambda\|_\infty+\frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}}. \qquad (7.5)\end{aligned}$$

The first two inequalities in (7.5) follow by the reasoning in (i), and the third follows by Lem. 6.2.

□

8 Central limit theorem for the classical process

This section concerns only the classical stochastic process (Y_t, K_t) satisfying the Kolmogorov equation (2.3) and beginning in the joint Gaussian state $\frac{1}{\pi\hbar}\exp(-\frac{1}{2b^2}y^2-\frac{2b^2}{\hbar^2}k^2)$. The analysis appearing here is a simplification of [6, Sect.6]. The component K_t is an autonomous Markov process with jump rates $J(p,p')$ from p' to p, and the component Y_t is a time integral $Y_t = Y_0 + \frac{1}{M}\int_0^t dr K_r$. The jump rates $J(p,p')$ have constant escape rates $\mathcal{R} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp J(p,p')$, and I refer to the jump times as the *Poisson times*. The Poisson times are denoted by t_n with the convention $t_0 = 0$, and $\mathcal{N}_t$ denotes the number of Poisson times up to time t.

I must introduce a number of technical definitions, which I will summarize in the list below. Let $S : \mathbb{R} \to \{\pm 1\}$ be the sign function. A *sign-flip* is a Poisson time t_n such that $S(K_{t_n}) = S(K_{t_{n+1}})$ and there are an odd number m of sign changes leading up to t_n: $S(K_{t_{n-r}}) = -S(K_{t_{n-r+1}})$ for $r \in [1,m]$ and $S(K_{t_{n-m-1}}) = S(K_{t_{n-m}})$. Note that under this definition a sign-flip time is not a hitting time with respect to the filtration generated by the process K_t, since the identification of a sign-flip time depends on a verification that the sign does not change again at the next Poisson time. This awkward definition is formed to avoid counting occurrences in which the momentum changes sign at successive pairs of Poisson times, which a detailed examination of the jump rates $J(p,p')$ shows is likely. The double-flipping is a small impediment to finding a more stable characterization for the sign behavior of the momentum process, and I have discussed this issue in detail at the beginning of [6, Sect.6]. Define the τ_m, $m \geq 0$ inductively to be the sequence of times such that $\tau_0 = 0$ and τ_{m+1} is the first time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ following τ_m for which t is a sign-flip or $|K_t| \notin \big[\frac{1}{2}|K_{\tau_m}|, \frac{3}{2}|K_{\tau_m}|\big]$. Introducing the cutoff for the deviation of the absolution value of the momentum over the interval $[\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ is a technical precaution, which I use because the τ_m's are less frequent over time intervals in which the momentum is high $|K_t| \gg \mathbf{p}$. I denote the number of non-zero τ_m's to have occurred up to time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ by $\mathbf{N}_t$. Pick $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1-\gamma}{2})$, and define ς to be the hitting time that $|K_t|$ jumps out of the interval $[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^\epsilon\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}+\lambda^\epsilon\mathbf{p}]$. The standard filtration generated by the process K_t is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\big(K_r : 0 \leq r \leq t\big)$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ be the filtration given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma\Big(\tau_{m+1},\, K_r\,:\, 0 \leq r \leq \tau_{m+1} \text{ for the } m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } t \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})\Big).$$

When $t \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ for some m, the σ-algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ contains knowledge of the time τ_{m+1} and all information about the process K_t up to time τ_{m+1}. For $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\lambda,s} := \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}$ and $\Delta\tau_m := \tau_{m+1} - \tau_m$, define the $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\lambda,s}$-adapted martingale

$$\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s} := \lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi\big(\tau_m < \varsigma\big)\,K_{\tau_m}\Big(\Delta\tau_m - \mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m \,\big|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big).$$

At a glance, the above definitions are given by the following:

$Y_{\lambda,s}$	The normalized integral functional: $Y_{\lambda,s} := \lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}\frac{1}{M}\int_0^{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} dtK_t$
t_n	nth Poisson time
$\mathcal{N}_t$	Number of Poisson times up to time t
ς	First time that $\lvert K_t\rvert$ jumps out of the interval $[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}+\lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}]$
τ_m	Time of mth sign-flip
$\Delta\tau_m$	Time elapsed between the mth and $m+1$th sign-flip: $\Delta\tau_m = \tau_{m+1}-\tau_m$
$\mathbf{N}_t \in \mathbb{N}$	Number of τ_m up to time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$
$\mathcal{F}_t$	Information up to time t
$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$	Information up to the time of the sign-flip following t
$\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s}$	Martingale with respect to $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\lambda,s}$ that approximates $Y_{\lambda,s}$ for $\lambda \ll 1$

Recall that $\vartheta := \frac{\mathbf{p}_0^3}{\nu M_0^2}$. The process $\big[\mathbf{m}_\lambda, \mathbf{m}_\lambda\big]_s$ refers to the quadratic variation of the martingale $\mathbf{m}_\lambda$.

Lemma 8.1. *In the limit $\lambda \to 0$, there are the following convergences in probability:*

1. $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\big|\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s} - Y_{\lambda,s}\big| \Longrightarrow 0$,
2. $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\Big|\big[\mathbf{m}_\lambda, \mathbf{m}_\lambda\big]_s - s\vartheta\Big| \Longrightarrow 0$.

Lemma 8.2 (Lindberg condition)**.** *As $\lambda \to 0$, there is convergence $\mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\big|\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s} - \mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s^-}\big|\big] \to 0$.*

Proof of Thm. 2.4. By Part (1) of Lem. 8.1, I can approximate the process $\big(Y_{\lambda,s},\, s\in[0,T]\big)$ by the martingale $\big(\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s},\, s\in[0,T]\big)$ in the limit $\lambda \to 0$. By [20, Thm.VIII.2.13], the martingale $\big(\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s},\, s\in[0,T]\big)$ converges in law to a Brownian motion with diffusion rate ϑ over the interval $s\in[0,T]$, if the following hold:

- The random variables $\big|\big[\mathbf{m}_\lambda, \mathbf{m}_\lambda\big]_s - s\vartheta\big|$ converge in probability to zero as $\lambda \to 0$ for $s\in[0,T]$.
- The random variables $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\big|\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s} - \mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s^-}\big|$ converge in probability to zero as $\lambda \to 0$.

The above statements are implied by Part (2) of Lem. 8.1 and Lem. 8.2, respectively. The convergence is with respect to the uniform metric.

□

9 Miscellaneous proofs

9.1 Proofs from Sect. 3

Proof of Lem. 3.2. The equality follows by expanding ρ in terms of its singular value decomposition and using that for $G\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $f,g\in\mathcal{H}$, then $\langle f|Gg\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi\big\langle \widehat{f}_\phi\big|\widetilde{G}_\phi\,\widehat{g}_\phi\big\rangle$ by the definition of $\widetilde{G}$. The following relations bound the integral norm of $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big\|_1 = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \big\|\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)\big\|_{\mathbf{1}} &= \sup_{\substack{\widetilde{G}\in L^\infty(\mathbb{T},\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))),\\ \|\widetilde{G}\|_\infty=1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\widetilde{G}_\phi e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big] \\ &= \sup_{\substack{G\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}},\\ \|G\|=1}} \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X} G e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}\big] \\ &\leq \|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}},\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality above holds by the definition of $\widetilde{G}$. The supremum on the first line is obtained as a maximum with $\widetilde{G}_\phi = e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}U_{\rho,\kappa,\phi}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}$ for the unitary $U_{\rho,\kappa,\phi}\in\mathcal{B}\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ in the polar decomposition of $\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)$, i.e., $\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho) = U_{\rho,\kappa,\phi}|\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)|$.

$\square$

Proof of Prop. 3.3.
Part (1): For a measurable set $A\subset\mathbb{T}$, let $G^{(A)}, G^{(A),\prime}, G^{(A),\prime\prime}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$ have respective corresponding elements in $L^\infty\big(\mathbb{T},\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{G}^{(A)}_\phi &:= \overline{s}_\phi 1_A(\phi)e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}|g_\phi\rangle\langle f_\phi|e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}, \\ \widetilde{G}^{(A),\prime}_\phi &:= s_\phi 1_A(\phi)|\psi_0\rangle\langle g_\phi|e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}, \\ \widetilde{G}^{(A),\prime\prime}_\phi &:= 1_A(\phi)|\psi_0\rangle\langle f_\phi|e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}},\end{aligned}$$

where $s_\phi := \frac{\langle f_\phi|\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)|g_\phi\rangle}{|\langle f_\phi|\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)|g_\phi\rangle|}$, and $X_{\mathbb{T}}\in\mathcal{B}\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ is defined as in the statement of Lem. 3.2. The choice of the vector $\psi_0\in L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ is arbitrary, and I will only use that $\langle\psi_0\,|\psi_0\rangle = 1$. Notice that for all $\phi\in\mathbb{T}$ $\widetilde{G}^{(A)}_\phi = (\widetilde{G}^{(A),\prime}_\phi)^*\widetilde{G}^{(A),\prime\prime}_\phi$, and thus $G^{(A)} = (G^{(A),\prime})^*G^{(A),\prime\prime}$.

The second and fifth equalities below invoke the definition for $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_A d\phi\big|\langle f_\phi\big|\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)\big|g_\phi\rangle\big| &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi\mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\widetilde{G}^{(A)}_\phi e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big] = \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}G^{(A)}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}\big] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big(G^{(A),\prime}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}|\rho|^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\big(G^{(A),\prime\prime}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}U_\rho|\rho|^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)\Big] \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big|G^{(A),\prime}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}|\rho|^{\frac{1}{2}}\big|^2\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big|G^{(A),\prime\prime}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}U_\rho|\rho|^{\frac{1}{2}}\big|^2\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\Big[|\rho|\big(e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}|G^{(A),\prime}|^2e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}\big)\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[|\rho|_*\big(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}|G^{(A),\prime\prime}|^2e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}\big)\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \Big(\int_A d\phi\big\langle g_\phi\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|)\big|g_\phi\big\rangle\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_A d\phi\big\langle f_\phi\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|_*)\big|f_\phi\big\rangle\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad (9.1)\end{aligned}$$

where $U_\rho\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the unitary operator in the polar decomposition of ρ. The third and fourth equalities hold by the cyclicity of trace, and the fourth also uses that $|\rho|_* = U_\rho|\rho|U^*_\rho$. The inequality is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $|\mathrm{Tr}[Y^*Z]|^2\leq\mathrm{Tr}[|Y|^2]\mathrm{Tr}[|Z|^2]$ for Hilbert-Schmidt operators Y,Z. For the fifth equality, the operators $e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}|G^{(A),\prime}|^2e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}$ and $e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}|G^{(A),\prime\prime}|^2e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}$ are in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$, and the corresponding elements in $L^\infty\big(\mathbb{T},\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$ are respectively $1_A(\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2})|g_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\rangle\langle g_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}|$ and $1_A(\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2})|f_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\rangle\langle f_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}|$.

Since (9.1) holds for all measurable sets $A\subset\mathbb{T}$, it follows that for a.e. $\phi\in\mathbb{T}$,

$$\big|\langle f_\phi\big|\ell^{(\kappa)}_\phi(\rho)\big|g_\phi\rangle\big| \leq \big\langle f_\phi\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|)\big|f_\phi\big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\langle g_\phi\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|_*)\big|g_\phi\big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Part (2): By definition $\langle\rho\rangle_{\phi}^{(\kappa)} = \mathrm{Tr}[\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)]$. The result follows by choosing an orthonormal basis for $L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ in which to compute the trace:

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathrm{Tr}[\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)]\big| =& \Big|\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle \psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big|\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big|\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big\rangle\Big| \\
\leq& \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle \psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|)\big|\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\langle \psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|_*)\big|\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq& \Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle \psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|)\big|\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big\rangle\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle \psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big|\ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|_*)\big|\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big\rangle\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
=&\mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|)\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}(|\rho|_*)\big]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \big(\langle|\rho|\rangle^{(0)}_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(\langle|\rho|_*\rangle^{(0)}_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above is by Part (1) and the second is Cauchy-Schwarz.

Part (3): By definition $[\rho]^{(k)}(p) := \langle\psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}|\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\rangle$ for $p = \phi \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $k = \kappa \bmod \frac{2\pi}{a}$. The result follows directly from Part (1). The same argument applies for $[\rho]_Q^{(k)}$.

$\square$

Proof of Prop. 3.4.
Part (1): The first and fourth equalities below hold by the definitions for $[\rho]^{(0)}$ and $\ell_{\phi}^{(0)}(\rho)$ respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp[\rho]^{(0)}(p) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big\langle\psi_p\big|\ell_{\phi}^{(0)}(\rho)\psi_p\big\rangle \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle\psi_{\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big|\ell_{\phi}^{(0)}(\rho)\psi_{\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\big\rangle \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi\mathrm{Tr}[\ell_{\phi}^{(0)}(\rho)] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho],
\end{aligned}$$

where on the first line $p = \phi \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$. The third equality uses that $\psi_{\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}$, $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ for each $\phi\in\mathbb{T}$. I also have the equality $\int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi\langle\rho\rangle_{\phi}^{(0)} = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho]$, since $\langle\rho\rangle_{\phi}^{(0)} = \mathrm{Tr}[\ell_{\phi}^{(0)}(\rho)]$. The argument is analogous for $[\rho]^{(0)}$ replaced by $[\rho]_Q^{(0)}$.

Part (2): Let $p, \hbar\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{a})$ be equal to $\phi, \hbar k$ modulo $\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $n := \frac{a}{2\pi}(k-\kappa)$. Since $e^{\mathrm{i}n\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}X} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{T}}$ for $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, the definition for $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)$ yields the second equality below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}kX}\big] &= \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}e^{\mathrm{i}n\frac{2\pi}{a}X}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X}\big] = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi\mathrm{Tr}\big[\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}e^{\mathrm{i}n\frac{2\pi}{a}X_{\mathbb{T}}}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big] \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m}\,\big|\,e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\kappa}{2}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m}\big\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \big\langle\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\,\big|\,\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\psi_{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big\rangle \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big\langle\psi_{p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\,\big|\,\ell_{\phi}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\psi_{p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}}\big\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp[\rho]^{(k)}(p).
\end{aligned}$$

The fourth equality uses that $e^{\mathrm{i}vX_{\mathbb{T}}}\psi_p = \psi_{p+\hbar v}$ for $p, v\in\mathbb{R}$.

Part (3): This is a consequence of Part (1) above and Parts (2) and (3) of Prop. 3.3.

$\square$

Proof of Prop. 3.5.
Part (1): The maps $\Phi_{\lambda,t} : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ satisfy the Duhamel equation

$$\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho) = e^{-\mathcal{R}t}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H} + \int_0^t dr e^{-\mathcal{R}(t-r)}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t-r}{\hbar}H}\Psi\big(\Phi_{\lambda,r}(\rho)\big)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t-r}{\hbar}H}. \tag{9.2}$$

Thus, I have the integral equation

$$\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) = e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\big(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}\big) + \int_0^t dr e^{-\mathcal{R}(t-r)}\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\Big(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t-r}{\hbar}H}\Psi\big(\Phi_{\lambda,r}(\rho)\big)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t-r}{\hbar}H}\Big).$$

From the definition of $\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)$, it can be shown that

$$\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\big(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H}\big) = e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}}\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}(\rho)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\big(\Psi(\rho)\big) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi'\widehat{\Psi}_{\phi-\phi'}\big(\ell_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big),$$

where $\widehat{\Psi}_\phi : \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ is defined for $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ as

$$\widehat{\Psi}_\phi(h) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} j\big(\phi + \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n\big)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{\hbar}(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)X_{\mathbb{T}}}he^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{\hbar}(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)X_{\mathbb{T}}}, \qquad h \in \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big).$$

From the above equalities, it follows that $\ell^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big)$ satisfies an integral equation of its own:

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big) =& e^{-\mathcal{R}t}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}}\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}(\rho)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}} \\ &+ \int_0^t dr e^{-\mathcal{R}(t-r)}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t-r}{\hbar}H_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi'\widehat{\Psi}_{\phi-\phi'}\big(\ell_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}(\Phi_{\lambda,r}(\rho))\big)\Big)e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{t-r}{\hbar}H_{\phi+\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}}.\end{aligned} \tag{9.3}$$

Since convolution with $\widehat{\Psi}_\phi$ is a bounded map on $L^1\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)\big)$ and the operators $e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{t}{\hbar}H_\phi}$, $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ are unitary, a semigroup $\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(\kappa)} : L^1\big(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}_1(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a))\big)$ can be constructed through the Dyson series corresponding to the integral equation (9.3) that satisfies $\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(\kappa)}\big(\ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big) = \ell_\phi^{(\kappa)}\big(\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big)$. The semigroup $\Gamma_{\lambda,t}^{(\kappa)}$ is contractive, since the noise term conforms to the bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \Big\| \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi'\widehat{\Psi}_{\phi-\phi'}\big(\ell_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big)\Big\|_{\mathbf{1}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi' J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi - \phi')\big\|\ell_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big\|_{\mathbf{1}} = \mathcal{R}\big\|\ell^{(\kappa)}(\rho)\big\|_1.$$

Part (2): By taking the trace of both sides of (9.3), I obtain the integral equation

$$\big\langle\Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle_\phi^{(\kappa)} = e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\big\langle\rho\big\rangle_\phi^{(\kappa)} + \int_0^t dr e^{-\mathcal{R}(t-r)}J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi, \phi')\big\langle\Phi_{\lambda,r}(\rho)\big\rangle_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}, \tag{9.4}$$

where I have used that $\mathrm{Tr}\big[\widehat{\Psi}_{\phi-\phi'}(h)\big] = J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi-\phi')\mathrm{Tr}[h]$ for $h \in \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$. Differentiating (9.4) yields the Kolmogorov equation.

Part (3): For all $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, I have the closed formula

$$\big\langle\Psi(\rho)\big\rangle_\phi^{(\kappa)} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi' J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi, \phi')\big\langle\rho\big\rangle_{\phi'}^{(\kappa)}.$$

Thus, taking the infemum norm of both sides yields the inequality

$$\big\|\big\langle\Psi(\rho)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_\infty \leq \Big(\sup_{\phi,\phi'\in\mathbb{T}} J_{\mathbb{T}}(\phi, \phi')\Big)\big\|\big\langle\rho\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\big\|_1 \leq \varpi\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}},$$

where the second inequality uses assumption (2) of List 1.1 followed by Part (3) of Prop. 3.4.

Part (4): The integral equation from Part (2) implies that $\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}$ can be written as

$$\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)} = e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\big\langle \rho\big\rangle^{(\kappa)} + \frac{J_{\mathbb{T}}}{\mathcal{R}}\Big(e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\mathcal{R}t)^n}{n!}\frac{J_{\mathbb{T}}^{n-1}}{\mathcal{R}^{n-1}}\Big)\big\langle \rho\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}.$$

The inequality $\|\big\langle \Phi_{\lambda,t}(\rho)\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\|_{\infty} \leq e^{-\mathcal{R}t}\|\big\langle \rho\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\|_{\infty} + \frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}$ follows by $\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\mathcal{R}t)^n}{n!}\frac{J_{\mathbb{T}}^{n-1}}{\mathcal{R}^{n-1}}\big\langle \rho\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\|_1 \leq \|\big\langle \rho\big\rangle^{(\kappa)}\|_1$ and the reasoning in Part (3).

□

9.2 Proofs from Sect. 5

The lemma below contains estimates for the square roots of the dispersion relation $E(p)$ and the Hamiltonian H.

Lemma 9.1. *There is a $C > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < 1$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$,*

1. $\Big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - \big(\frac{p^2}{2M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big| \leq C\big(\frac{\hbar^2}{a^2 M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$,
2. $\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)\Big] \leq C\big(\frac{\alpha}{a}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + \frac{a}{b})$.

Proof.
Part (1): The inequality holds with $C = 2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, since $\big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - \big(\frac{p^2}{2M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big| = (2M)^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\mathbf{q}(p) - p|$, and by the Krönig-Penney relation (1.5), the values $\mathbf{q}(p)$ and p can not be separated by more than $\frac{\hbar}{a}$.

Part (2): Since $\check{\rho} := |\mathfrak{g}\rangle\langle\mathfrak{g}|$ for $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathcal{H}$ of the form (1.1) in the position representation, I have the first equality below:

$$\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Big] = \Big\langle \mathfrak{g}\Big|H^{\frac{1}{2}} - \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big|\mathfrak{g}\Big\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} d\phi \Big\langle \widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\phi}\Big|H_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}} - \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big|\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\phi}\Big\rangle. \tag{9.5}$$

The second equality invokes the fiber decomposition discussed in Sect. 3.1. The operators H_{ϕ}, $(\frac{P^2}{2M})_{\phi}$ for $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ denote the operation of H and $\frac{P^2}{2M}$ on the ϕ-fiber copy of $L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ in the tensor product decomposition $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{T}) \otimes L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$.

By using the formula $u^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty} d\epsilon\, \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{u}{\epsilon+u}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and functional calculus [21, Ch.VIII.Ex.50], I can write the difference between the square roots of the Hamiltonians H_{ϕ} and $\big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}} - \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}} =& \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty}\frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big(\frac{H_{\phi}}{\epsilon + H_{\phi}} - \frac{\big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}}\Big) \\ =& \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\frac{\alpha}{a}}\frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big(\frac{H_{\phi}}{\epsilon + H_{\phi}} - \frac{\big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}}\Big) + \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\frac{\alpha}{a}}^{\infty} d\epsilon\, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + H_{\phi}}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

However, the operators in the integrands have the bounds

$$\text{(i).}\ \Big\|\frac{H_{\phi}}{\epsilon + H_{\phi}} - \frac{\big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}}\Big\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{(ii).}\ \Big\langle \widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\phi}\Big|\frac{1}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_{\phi}} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + H_{\phi}}\Big|\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\phi}\Big\rangle \leq c\frac{\alpha a}{\epsilon^2 b\hbar},$$

where the second inequality is for some $c > 0$. The inequality (i) uses that the function $\frac{x}{\epsilon+x}$ is operator monotonically increasing for each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and that $\frac{H}{\epsilon+H} \leq 1$. I will prove (ii) below. Applying (9.5) and (9.6) with the inequalities (i) and (ii) yields the bound

$$\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_\lambda\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Big] \leq \frac{2}{\pi}\big(\frac{\alpha}{a}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 4c\big(\frac{\alpha a}{b^2}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which has the form claimed.

(ii). The operator $\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_\phi$ has Green function $G_{\phi,\epsilon} : \mathcal{I}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with the closed form

$$G_{\phi,\epsilon}(x) = \frac{1}{a}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\epsilon + \frac{(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)^2}{2M}} e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)}.$$

Let $A_{\phi,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{B}_1\big(L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)\big)$ be defined as the rank $A_{\phi,\epsilon}(x,y) = |G_{\phi,\epsilon}\rangle\langle G_{\phi,\epsilon}|$. By the general theory of Schrödinger operators with point potentials [2], the difference between the resolvents of H_ϕ and $\big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_\phi$ has the closed form

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_\phi} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + H_\phi} = \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha G_{\phi,\epsilon}(0)} A_{\phi,\epsilon}. \tag{9.7}$$

The Fourier coefficients of $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_\phi \in L^2(\mathcal{I}_a)$ have the form

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}_a} dx \widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_\phi(x) \frac{e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{x}{\hbar}(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)}}{\sqrt{a}} = \big(\frac{2b^2}{\pi\hbar^2}\big)^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{b^2(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-\mathbf{p})^2}{\hbar^2}},$$

and thus evaluating (9.7) with the state $|\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_\phi\rangle$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\langle \widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_\phi\Big|\frac{1}{\epsilon + \big(\frac{P^2}{2M}\big)_\phi} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + H_\phi}\Big|\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_\phi\Big\rangle =& \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha G_{\phi,\epsilon}(0)} \big|\langle \widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_\phi | G_{\phi,\epsilon}\rangle\big|^2 \\ =& \frac{\frac{\alpha b}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} a\hbar}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\epsilon + \frac{(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)^2}{2M}\big|^{-1} e^{-\frac{b^2(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-\mathbf{p})^2}{\hbar^2}}\Big)^2}{1+\frac{\alpha}{a}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\epsilon + \frac{(\phi+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)^2}{2M}\big|^{-1}} \\ \leq& c\frac{\alpha a}{\epsilon^2 b\hbar},\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds for some $c > 0$.

□

Proof of Lem 5.1. The integral $\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{t}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}_Q(p)$ over the domain $\big||p| - \mathbf{p}\big| \leq \lambda^\epsilon \mathbf{p}$ has the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{||p|-\mathbf{p}|\leq\lambda^\epsilon\mathbf{p}} \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}_Q(p) \leq& \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}_Q(p)\big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\big|^2}{\inf_{||p|-\mathbf{p}|\leq\lambda^\epsilon\mathbf{p}}\big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\big|^2} \\ <& \frac{8M}{\mathbf{p}^2\lambda^{2\epsilon}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}_Q(p)\big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\big|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{9.8}$$

The first inequality is Chebyshev's and the second uses that $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) \approx \frac{|p|}{(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ for $|p| \gg \frac{\hbar}{a}$; see Part (1) of Lem. 9.5. The analysis below shows that the integral on the bottom line of (9.8) is bounded by a constant multiple of $\lambda^{1-\gamma}$. This would imply that $\int_{||p|-\mathbf{p}|\leq\lambda^\epsilon\mathbf{p}} \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}\big]^{(0)}_Q(p)$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $\lambda^{1-\gamma-2\epsilon}$, which is the statement of the lemma.

Using the unravelment for the dynamical map $\Phi_{\lambda,t} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ from Lem. 4.2, I have the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \big[\rho_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big]_{Q}^{(0)}(p)\big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\big|^{2} =& \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Phi_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\check{\rho}_{\lambda})\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big)^{2}\Big] \\ =& \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)H^{\frac{1}{2}}U_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big)^{2}\Big]\Big] \\ \leq& \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)HU_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - H\Big)\Big]\Big]\Big| \\ &+ 2E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big|\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big)\Big]\Big| + \Big|\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(H - E(\mathbf{p})\Big)\Big]\Big|. \end{aligned} \tag{9.9}$$

To obtain the inequality (9.9), I write

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)H^{\frac{1}{2}}U_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p})\Big)^{2} =& \Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)HU_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - H\Big) - 2E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big) \\ &+ \Big(H - E(\mathbf{p})\Big) - 2E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)H^{\frac{1}{2}}U_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - H^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{9.10}$$

and use the triangle inequality for the first three terms. The fourth term on the right side of (9.10) can be removed, since it has negative contribution by the inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)H^{\frac{1}{2}}U_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - H^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Big]\Big] \geq 0. \tag{9.11}$$

The inequality (9.11) holds since the process $U^{*}_{\lambda,t}(\xi)H^{\frac{1}{2}}U_{\lambda,t}(\xi) - H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is an operator-valued submartingale by Part (1) of Prop. 4.3.

For the term in the third line of (9.9), the second equality below holds by Part (2) of Prop. 4.3:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(U^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi)HU_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(\xi) - H\Big)\Big]\Big] = \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(\Phi^{*}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}(H) - H\Big)\Big] = \frac{\sigma T}{2M\lambda^{\gamma}}.$$

The two terms on the last line of (9.9) are similar, so I will handle the first. The factor $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}) = (\frac{\mathbf{p}_{0}^{2}}{2M_{0}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is $O(\lambda^{0})$, and by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p})\Big)\Big]\Big| \leq& \Big|\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big(H^{\frac{1}{2}} - (\frac{P^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Big]\Big| + \Big|\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big((\frac{P^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}} - (\frac{\mathbf{p}^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Big]\Big| \\ &+ \sup_{p\in\mathbb{R}}\Big|(\frac{p^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}} - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)\Big|. \end{aligned} \tag{9.12}$$

The first and third terms on the right side of (9.12) are bounded by constant multiples of $(\frac{\alpha}{a})^{\frac{1}{2}} = (\frac{\alpha_{0}}{a_{0}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $(\frac{\hbar^{2}}{Ma^{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}} = (\frac{\hbar_{0}^{2}}{M_{0}a_{0}^{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ respectively by Parts (2) and (1) of Lem. 9.1. The second term on the right side of (9.12) decays exponentially for small λ, since

$$\Big|\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\check{\rho}_{\lambda}\Big((\frac{P^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}} - (\frac{\mathbf{p}^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Big]\Big| = \Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \frac{e^{-\frac{2b^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}(p-\mathbf{p})^{2}}}{(\pi\frac{\hbar^{2}}{b^{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}}(\frac{p^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}} - (\frac{\mathbf{p}^{2}}{2M})^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big| \leq M^{-\frac{1}{2}}\int_{|r|\geq\frac{\mathbf{p}b}{\hbar}} dr\, r\frac{e^{-2r^{2}}}{(\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

and the integral on the right can be evaluated, where $\frac{\mathbf{p}b}{\hbar} = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\mathbf{p}_{0}b_{0}}{\hbar_{0}}$.

□

9.3 Proofs from Sect. 6

Recall that the function $\mathbf{n}:\mathbb{R}\rightarrow\mathbb{Z}$ is defined such that $\mathbf{n}(p)=\frac{a}{\pi\hbar}\big(p-\theta\big)$ for $\theta\in[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a},\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ with $p=\theta \bmod \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}$. Given $p,v\in\mathbb{R}$, define the set $I(p,v)\subset\mathbb{Z}$ to be

$$I(p,v):=\big\{0,-\mathbf{n}(p),-\mathbf{n}(p+v),\mathbf{n}(p)-\mathbf{n}(p+v)\big\}.$$

The following technical lemma is from [6, Lem.4.1].

Lemma 9.2. *There exists a $C>0$ such that the following inequalities hold:*

1. *For all $\lambda<1$ and $p\in\mathbb{R}$,*
$$\sum_{n\notin I(p,v)}|\kappa_v(p,n)|^2\leq\frac{C}{1+\big|\frac{a}{\hbar}p\big|^2}.$$

2. *For all $\lambda<1$, $m,n\in\mathbb{Z}$ with $m\neq-\mathbf{n}(p)$, $n\neq0$, and $\big|\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}m-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-p\big|\leq\frac{1}{2}|p|$,*
$$\int_{-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}}^{\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}}d\theta\,\big|\kappa_{\theta+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}m-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-p}\big(p,\,n\big)\big|^2\leq\frac{C\frac{\hbar}{a}}{1+\big|\frac{a}{\hbar}p\big|}.$$

The bounds from Lem. 9.2 will be applied in the proof of Lem. 9.3. Define the function $\mathbf{Q}:\mathbb{R}\rightarrow\{0,1\}$ as $\mathbf{Q}(p)=1-\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}1_{[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n+\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]}(p)$. I introduce the factor $\mathbf{Q}(p)$ in the statement of Lem. 9.3 and the proof of Lem. 6.1 to ensure that $p+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$ and $p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$ live on the same energy band for $p\in\operatorname{Supp}(\mathbf{Q})$ and $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$. Throughout the analysis of this section, the reader should remember that $\hbar k$ for $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ is negligible compared to the length $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}$ between momenta satisfying the Bragg condition. In the proof of Lem. 9.3, I rely mainly on decay that arises from $\hbar^{-1}|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)|$ for large $|N|$. However, it can occur that $|N|\gg1$ but that the energies $E(p)$ and $E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)$ are not far apart, in which case I use Lem. 9.2 to extract some additional decay from the sum $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|$.

Lemma 9.3. *Let $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ and $\rho\in\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be positive. There is a $C>0$ such that for $\lambda\ll1$,*

$$\sum_{N\neq0}\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\,\mathbf{Q}(p)\int_{\mathbb{R}}dvj(v)\Big|[\rho]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}N)}\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big|$$
$$\times\frac{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|}{\hbar^{-1}\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|}\leq C\lambda^{\varrho}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}.$$

Proof of Lem. 9.3. By splitting the integration $\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp$ in to parts $|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|>\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$, I have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{N\neq0}&\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\mathbf{Q}(p)\int_{\mathbb{R}}dvj(v)\Big|[\rho]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}N)}\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big|\frac{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|}{\hbar^{-1}\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|}\\
&\leq\Big(\frac{\mathcal{R}\hbar}{\inf_{n\in\mathbf{N}}g_n}\Big)\sum_{N\neq0}\int_{|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}}dp\int_{\mathbb{R}}dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}\Big|[\rho]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}N)}\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big|\\
&\quad\times\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|+\lambda^{\varrho}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}\sum_{N\neq0}C_N,\end{aligned}\tag{9.13}$$

where g_n is the nth energy band gap, and the values $C_N>0$ are defined as

$$C_N=\sup_{|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\geq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}dvj(v)\,\frac{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|}{\frac{\lambda^{\varrho}}{\hbar}\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|}.$$

For the domain $|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$, I have used that the momenta p and $p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$ belong to different energy bands when $p\in\mathrm{Supp}(\mathbf{Q})$, $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$, and $N\neq0$. It follows that $\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|$ must be bounded from below by the infemum of the energy gaps g_n. For the domain $|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|>\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$, I have applied Holder's inequality and $\big\|\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}N)}\big\|_1\leq\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}$, where the latter follows by Part (3) of Prop. 3.4. I will show that the first and second terms on the right side of (9.13) are bounded by multiples of $\lambda^{\varrho}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}$ in parts (i) and (ii) respectively below.

(i). For the first term on the right side of (9.13), $\frac{\mathcal{R}\hbar}{\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}g_n}$ is bounded by a multiple of λ^{ϱ}, since the gaps g_n are bounded from below by a constant multiple of $\frac{\alpha}{a}$. Moreover, the integral has the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{N\neq0}&\int_{|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}}dp\int_{\mathbb{R}}dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}\Big|\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}N)}\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big|\\&\times\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|\\\leq&\sum_{N\neq0}\int_{|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}}dp\,\Big(\frac{1}{2}\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(0)}(p)+\frac{1}{2}\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(0)}\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big)\\\leq&4\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(0)}(p)=4\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}.\end{aligned}\tag{9.14}$$

For the first inequality above, I have used that $\int_{\mathbb{R}}dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}=1$ and applied the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}&\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|\\&\leq\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\leq1.\end{aligned}\tag{9.15}$$

Also for the first inequality in (9.14), I have applied Part (3) of Prop. 3.3 to $\big[\rho\big]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}N)}$ in combination with the relation $|xy|\leq\frac{x^2}{2}+\frac{y^2}{2}$.

(ii). It is sufficient to prove that the sum of the C_N's is finite and has a bound independent of $\lambda<1$. I will show that C_N's decay on the order of $|N|^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. A single C_N can be bounded independently of $\lambda<1$ by the same reasoning as in (i). The difference $|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)|$ becomes large for large $|N|\gg1$ except when $p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$ is close to $-p$. By the restrictions $|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\geq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$, the momenta p and $p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$ can not lie on the same or neighboring energy bands. Thus, the absolute value of the difference between the energies $E(p)$ and $E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)$ must be at least the length $L_{|N|}$ for L_m defined by

$$L_m:=E\Big(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}m\Big)-E\Big(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}(m-1)\Big)=\frac{\pi^2\hbar^2}{2Ma^2}\big(2m-1\big),\qquad m\in\mathbb{N}.$$

By the same reasoning, if $|p|\wedge|p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq|\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}N|$, then the momenta p and $p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$ must be separated by the energy bands with band index between $\frac{1}{4}|N|$ and $\frac{3}{4}|N|$:

$$\Big|E(p)-E\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\Big|\geq\sum_{\frac{1}{4}|N|<m<\frac{3}{4}|N|}L_m\propto\frac{\hbar^2}{Ma^2}N^2,\tag{9.16}$$

where the $|N|\gg1$ asymptotic proportion is by a unitless factor.

By the above remarks, $C_N < \frac{\mathcal{R}M_0 a_0^2}{\pi\hbar_0|N|}C'_N + C''_N$, where C'_N and C''_N are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} C'_N \quad &:= \quad \sup_{\substack{|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N|\geq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a},\\ |p|\wedge|p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N|\geq|\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}N|}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v\big(p,n\big)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|, \\ C''_N \quad &:= \quad \sup_{|p|\wedge|p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq|\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}N|}\int_{\mathbb{R}} dvj(v)\frac{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v\big(p,n\big)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|}{\frac{\lambda^{\varrho}}{\hbar}\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|}. \end{aligned}$$

By the same reasoning as in (i), I have the inequality below

$$C''_N \leq \sup_{|p|\wedge|p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N|\leq|\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}N|}\frac{\mathcal{R}\hbar}{\lambda^{\varrho}\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|} = \frac{\mathcal{R}M_0a_0^2}{\hbar_0}O\big(|N|^{-2}\big).$$

The order equality follows from (9.16). Thus, the C''_N's decay quadratically and are summable. In the analysis below, I show that the C'_N's have order $O(|N|^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, which implies that the C_N's are summable.

Bounding the C'_N's is trickier than the C''_N's, since I depend on some decay for large $|N|$ arising from the sum of the terms $|\kappa_v(p,n)|\,|\kappa_v(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N)|$, and there are various cases in which $|\kappa_v(p,n)|$ and $|\kappa_v(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N)|$ may not both be small. As a preliminary, I will partition the integration over $v\in\mathbb{R}$ into the sets $|v|>\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|$ and $|v|\leq\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|$. For the domain $|v|>\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|$ there is quadratic decay, since Chebyshev's inequality and (9.15) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|v|>\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|}dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v(p+\hbar k+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N)\big| &\leq \int_{|v|\geq\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}N}dv\,\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}} \\ &\leq \frac{16\sigma a_0^2}{\pi^2\mathcal{R}\hbar_0^2}|N|^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma=\int_{\mathbb{R}}dvj(v)v^2$. For the domain $|v|\leq\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|$, I will rely on the results from Lem. 9.2. Given $p,v\in\mathbb{R}$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (9.15) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\big|\kappa_v\big(p,n\big)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big| \\ &\quad\leq \sum_{\substack{n\in I(p,v),\\ n\in I(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,v)+N}}\big|\kappa_v\big(p,n\big)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big| \\ &\qquad+\Big(\sum_{n\notin I(p,v)}\big|\kappa_v\big(p,n\big)\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\Big(\sum_{n\notin I(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,v)+N}\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n\big)\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.17}$$

Under the constraints $|p|\wedge|p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N|\geq\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}|N|$ and $|v|\leq\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|$, Part (1) of Lem. 9.2 implies that the terms on the bottom line of (9.17) are bounded by multiples of $|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|^{-1}\leq|N|^{-1}$ and $|\frac{a}{\hbar}(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)|^{-1}\leq|N|^{-1}$, respectively. Since the total weight of the integration $\int_{|v|\leq\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}|N|}dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}$ is less than one, these terms make contributions to C'_N that vanish with order $O(|N|^{-\frac{1}{2}})$.

The final task is to bound the sum on the second line of (9.17). Let $p':=p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$. Note that $p'\approx p+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N$, since $|\hbar k|\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a_0}\ll\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$. The inequalities $|p|\wedge|p'|\geq\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}|N|$ and $|v|\leq\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}$ imply that the set $\big(I(p',v)+N\big)\cup I(p,v)$ must be empty unless the momenta p and p' have opposite signs. If p and p' have opposite signs, the matching possibilities for elements in $I(p,v)$ and $I(p',v)+N$ are those in the same rows below:

$I(p,v)$	$I(p',v)+N$
$0, \mathbf{n}(p)-\mathbf{n}(p+v)$	$-\mathbf{n}(p')+N, -\mathbf{n}(p'+v)+N$
$-\mathbf{n}(p), -\mathbf{n}(p+v)$	$N, -\mathbf{n}(p')+\mathbf{n}(p'+v)+N$

However, the inequalities $|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N| \geq \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $|\hbar k| \ll \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ leave only the possibilities:

$I(p,v)$	$I(p',v)+N$
0	$-\mathbf{n}(p'+v)+N$
$\mathbf{n}(p)-\mathbf{n}(p+v)$	$-\mathbf{n}(p')+N$
$-\mathbf{n}(p)$	$-\mathbf{n}(p')+\mathbf{n}(p'+v)+N$
$-\mathbf{n}(p+v)$	N

For each case of $n \in (I(p',v)+N) \cup I(p,v)$, either $n \neq 0, -\mathbf{n}(p)$ or $n' := n-N$ satisfies $n' = 0, -\mathbf{n}(p')$. The cases listed above are similar, so I will take $n = N = -\mathbf{n}(p+v)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{|p+\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N| \geq \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}, \\ |p| \wedge |p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N| \geq |\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}N|}} & \int_{|v| \leq |\frac{\pi\hbar}{4a}N|} dv\, \frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}} \big|\kappa_v\big(p,N\big)\big| \big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,0\big)\big| \chi\big(N=-\mathbf{n}(p+v)\big) \\ & \leq \frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}} \big(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{|p| \geq |\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}N|} \Big(\int_{-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}}^{\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}} d\theta \big|\kappa_{\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N-p+\theta}\big(p,N\big)\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{\varpi}{\mathcal{R}} \big(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{c}{|N|^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \tag{9.18}$$

where the second inequality is for some $c > 0$ by Part (2) of Lem. 9.2. In the expression on the first line of (9.18), the integrand has support over the set $v \in \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N - p + [-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2a}]$ because of the factor $\chi(N = -\mathbf{n}(p+v))$. In the fist inequality of (9.18), I have used that $j(v) \leq \varpi$ by assumption (2) of List 1.1, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and that $\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,0\big)\big| \leq 1$.

□

The proof of Lem. 6.1 proceeds by subtracting-off small parts from the expressions

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \mathcal{R}^{-1} U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)} \big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H} \check{\rho}_\lambda e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)} T_\lambda^{(k)} U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)} [\check{\rho}_\lambda]_Q^{(k)}$$

such that the difference between the remaining expressions can be bounded by an application of Lem. 9.3. The parts removed from the expressions are associated with momenta near the lattice $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$, as usual, and also momenta that are "too high". For technical purpose, capping the momentum is necessary to maintain that the difference of energies $|E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}) - E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})|$ is small compared to $\frac{\alpha}{a}$, which is the scale for the gaps between the energy bands; recall $\lim_{N\rightarrow\infty} g_N = \frac{2\alpha}{a}$. Although assuming that $p \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathbf{Q})$ guarantees $p \pm \frac{\hbar k}{2}$ are on the same energy band, there will still be linear growth $|E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}) - E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})| \approx \frac{|p\hbar k|}{M}$ for high momenta $p \in \mathbb{R}$ bounded away from the lattice $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}$. The linear rate of growth $\frac{|\hbar k|}{M} = \frac{\hbar_0}{a_0 M_0} O(\lambda^{2+\varrho})$ for $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ is, however, slow.

Proof of Lem. 6.1. Let $\mathbf{Q}$, $\mathbf{Q}'$, $\mathbf{Q}''$ be the projections on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, or alternatively $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, that act as multiplication by the functions

$$\mathbf{Q}(p) = 1 - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} 1_{[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n - \frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n + \frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]}(p), \quad \mathbf{Q}'(p) = 1_{|p| \leq \frac{\hbar}{a\lambda^{1+\frac{\varrho}{2}}}}, \quad \mathbf{Q}''(p) = \mathbf{Q}(p)\mathbf{Q}'(p).$$

Also, denote $\widetilde{\rho} = \rho - (I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})$. There is a $C > 0$ such that the following inequalities hold for all $\lambda < 1$, $|k| \leq \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$, and $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$:

(i).

$$\Big\| \int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}''\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\widetilde{\rho}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1$$
$$\leq C(s_2-s_1)\Big(\lambda^{2+\varrho}\frac{Ma^2}{\hbar^2}\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho] + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\|\langle\rho\rangle^{(0)}\|_\infty + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}\Big).$$

(ii).

$$\Big\| \int_{s_1}^{s_2} drU_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}T_\lambda^{(k)}U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)}[\rho]_Q^{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}''\int_{s_1}^{s_2} drU_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}T_\lambda^{(k)}U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)}[\widetilde{\rho}]_Q^{(k)}\Big)\Big\|_1$$
$$\leq C(s_2-s_1)\Big(\lambda^{2+\varrho}\frac{Ma^2}{\hbar^2}\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho] + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\|\langle\rho\rangle^{(0)}\|_\infty + \lambda^{1+\varrho}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}\Big).$$

(iii).

$$\Big\|\mathbf{Q}''\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\Big(\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\widetilde{\rho}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)} - U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}T_\lambda^{(k)}U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)}[\widetilde{\rho}]_Q^{(k)}\Big)\Big\|_1 \leq C\mathcal{R}^{-1}\lambda^\varrho$$

(i). By the triangle inequality, $\mathbf{Q}''(p)\leq 1$, and $1-\mathbf{Q}''(p)\leq 1-\mathbf{Q}(p)+1-\mathbf{Q}'(p)$, the left side of (i) is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|(I-\mathbf{Q}')\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 + \Big\|(I-\mathbf{Q})\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 \\
&\quad + \Big\|\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}(I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 \\
&\leq \mathcal{R}^{-1}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\Big\|(I-\mathbf{Q}')\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 + \mathcal{R}^{-1}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\Big\|(I-\mathbf{Q})\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 \\
&\quad + (s_2-s_1)\big\|(I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})\big\|_{\mathbf{1}}
\end{aligned} \tag{9.19}$$

The inequality above uses that $U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}$ is a multiplication operator with multiplication function bounded by one, i.e., $|U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}(p)|\leq 1$. Also, for the last term, I have applied Part (3) of Prop. 3.4 to get the inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big\|\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}(I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 &\leq \big\|\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}(I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big\|_{\mathbf{1}} \\
&= \mathcal{R}\|(I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})\|_{\mathbf{1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right side of (9.19),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}^{-1}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\Big\|(I-\mathbf{Q}')\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 &\leq \mathcal{R}^{-1}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\int_{|p|>\frac{\hbar}{2a\lambda^{1+\frac{\varrho}{2}}}}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(0)}(p) \\
&\leq \frac{8\lambda^{2+2\varrho}a^2M}{\mathcal{R}\hbar^2}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\int_{\mathbb{R}} dpE(p)\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(0)}(p) \\
&= \frac{8\lambda^{2+2\varrho}a^2M}{\mathcal{R}\hbar^2}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\mathrm{Tr}\big[H\Psi\big(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\big)\big] \\
&= \frac{8\lambda^{2+2\varrho}a^2M}{\hbar^2}\big(\mathrm{Tr}[H\rho] + \frac{\sigma}{2\mathcal{R}M}\mathrm{Tr}[\rho]\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{9.20}$$

The first inequality above is by Part (3) of Prop 3.3 and holds for λ small enough so that $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a_0} \le \frac{\hbar}{2a\lambda^{1+\frac{\varrho}{2}}}$. The second inequality in (9.20) is Chebyshev's with $E(p) \ge \frac{p^2}{2M}$, and the second equality is by the explicit form $\Psi^*(H) = \mathcal{R}H + \frac{\sigma}{2M}I$.

To bound the second term on the right side of (9.19), notice that by Part (3) of Prop. 3.3 and the inequality $|2xy| \le x^2 + y^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \Big\|(I-\mathbf{Q})\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}\Big\|_1 \le & \frac{1}{2}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big(1-\mathbf{Q}(p)\big)\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(0)}\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp\big(1-\mathbf{Q}(p)\big)\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(0)}\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big) \\ \le & (s_2-s_1)\lambda^{1+\varrho}\frac{12\pi\varpi\hbar_0}{a_0}\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.21}$$

To see the second inequality above, notice that the first is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \int_{[-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]\cup[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}]\cup[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a},-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}+\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]} d\phi\Big\langle\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\Big\rangle_{\phi-\frac{\hbar\kappa}{2}}^{(0)} \\ & = \frac{6\pi\hbar}{a_0}\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr \Big\|\Big\langle\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\Big\rangle^{(0)}\Big\|_\infty \\ & \le \lambda^{1+\varrho}\frac{6\pi\hbar_0\varpi}{a_0}(s_2-s_1)\|\rho\|_{\mathbf{1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa \in [-\frac{\pi}{a_0},\frac{\pi}{a_0})$ with $\kappa = k \mod \frac{2\pi}{a_0}$. The inequality above is by Part (3) of Prop. 3.5 and the fact that the trace norm is invariant of unitary conjugation. The second term after the first inequality in (9.21) has the same bound.

For the third term on the right side of (9.19),

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|(I-\mathbf{Q})\rho(I-\mathbf{Q})\big\|_{\mathbf{1}} = & \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_{[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n+\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]} dp[\rho]_Q^{(0)}(p) \\ = & \int_{[-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]\cup[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}]\cup[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a},-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}+\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]} d\phi\langle\rho\rangle_\phi^{(0)} \\ \le & \lambda^{1+\varrho}\frac{12\pi\hbar_0}{a_0}\big\|\langle\rho\rangle^{(0)}\big\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(ii). This follows by similar analysis as for (i).

(iii). By an evaluation of the integral, I have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{Q}''(p)\int_{s_1}^{s_2} dr\Big(\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\rho e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}(p) - U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}T_\lambda^{(k)}U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)}[\widetilde{\rho}]_Q^{(k)}(p)\Big) \\ & = 1_A(p,v,n,m)\int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\,\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}\sum_{n\ne m}\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v,n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v,m\big) \\ & \quad\times[\rho]_Q^{(k+\frac{2\pi}{a}(n-m))}\big(p-v-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}(n+m)\big) \\ & \quad\times \mathrm{i}\hbar\Big(\frac{e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{s_2}{\hbar}\big(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v)-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v)-E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})+E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\big)}}{E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v)-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v)-E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})+E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})} \\ & \quad - \frac{e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{s_1}{\hbar}\big(E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v)-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v)-E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})+E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\big)}}{E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v)-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v)-E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})+E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{9.22}$$

where $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{Z}^2$ is the set of p,v,n,m such that:

(I). Either $p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v$ or $p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v$ is not in the set $\cup_{N\in\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N+\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]$.

(II). The number p is not in the set $\cup_{N\in\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N-\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0},\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}N+\frac{3\pi\hbar}{a_0}]$, and $|p|\leq\frac{\hbar}{a\lambda^{1+\varrho}}$.

I will argue below that statements (I) and (II) guarantee the inequality

$$\Big|E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})\Big|\leq\frac{1}{2}\Big|E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v)-E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v)\Big|, \tag{9.23}$$

which obviously implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v\big)-&E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v\big)-E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)+E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)\Big|^{-1}\\ &\leq 2\Big|E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v\big)-E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v\big)\Big|^{-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{9.24}$$

It is an advantage to have a simplified denominator in later analysis, and the purpose of introducing $\mathbf{Q}''$ and $\widetilde{\rho}$ earlier in the proof was to avoid some scenarios in which the denominator on the left side of (9.24) becomes small.

To see (9.23), notice that statement (I) and $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ imply that $p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v$ and $p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v$ always lie on different energy bands for $n\neq m$. It follows that

$$\Big|E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v\big)-E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}m-v\big)\Big|\geq\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}g_n\geq c'\frac{\alpha}{a}, \tag{9.25}$$

where g_n is the nth gap between energy bands, and the second inequality holds for small enough $c'>0$. Moreover, statement (II) implies that $p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}$ and $p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}$ belong to same energy band, and I have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|E\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)-E\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)\Big|&\leq\frac{1}{M}\Big(\sup_{\pm}\big|\mathbf{q}(p\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2})\big|\Big)\Big(\sup_{p\in\mathbb{R}-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}}\big|\mathbf{q}'(p)\big|\Big)\\ &\leq c''\hbar k\frac{\pi\hbar}{Ma}\Big\lceil\frac{a|p|}{\pi\hbar}\Big\rceil\leq c''\frac{2|p\hbar k|}{M}\leq\frac{c'}{2}\frac{\alpha}{a},\end{aligned} \tag{9.26}$$

where $c'':=\sup_{p\in\mathbb{R}-\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}}\big|\mathbf{q}'(p)\big|$ is finite by Part (2) or Lem. 9.5. The last inequality in (9.26) is for small enough λ and uses the constraints $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$, $|p|\leq\frac{\hbar}{a\lambda^{1+\frac{\varrho}{2}}}$ so that

$$\frac{|p\hbar k|}{M}\leq\frac{2\pi\hbar^2}{aa_0M\lambda^{1+\frac{\varrho}{2}}}=\frac{\hbar_0^2}{a_0^2M_0}O(\lambda^{1+\frac{\varrho}{2}}),$$

whereas $\frac{\alpha}{a}=\frac{\alpha_0}{a_0}\lambda$. The second inequality in (9.26) holds since $\mathbf{q}:\mathbb{R}\rightarrow\mathbb{R}_+$ is monotonically increasing, the highest value on the energy band containing $p\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2}$ is $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\lceil\frac{a|p|}{\pi\hbar}\rceil$, and there is the explicit evaluation $\mathbf{q}(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\lceil\frac{a|p|}{\pi\hbar}\rceil)=\frac{\hbar\pi}{a}\lceil\frac{a|p|}{\pi\hbar}\rceil$. Combining (9.25) and (9.26) yields (9.23).

Making a change of variables $p-\frac{\hbar k}{2}-\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n-v\rightarrow p$ and $N=n-m$, then the relations (9.22) and (9.24) imply the first inequality below

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\mathbf{Q}'\int_{s_1}^{s_2}dr\Big(\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}\big[\Psi(e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H}\widetilde{\rho}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{r}{\hbar}H})\big]_Q^{(k)}-U_{\lambda,-r}^{(k)}T_\lambda^{(k)}U_{\lambda,r}^{(k)}[\widetilde{\rho}]_Q^{(k)}\Big)\Big\|_1\\ &\quad\leq\frac{2}{\mathcal{R}}\sum_{N\neq0}\int_{\mathbb{R}}dp\,\mathbf{Q}(p)\int_{\mathbb{R}}dv\,j(v)\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\big|\rho\big(p,p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N\big)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\,\big|\kappa_v\big(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N,n-N\big)\big|}{\hbar^{-1}\big|E(p)-E(p+\hbar k+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}N)\big|}\\ &\quad\leq c\mathcal{R}^{-1}\lambda^{\varrho}.\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is for some $c>0$ by Lem. 9.3.

□

9.4 Proofs from Sect. 7

The proofs for Parts (1) and (2) of Lem. 7.1 are contained in Sects. 9.4.1 and 9.4.2, respectively.

9.4.1 Estimates for the dispersion relation

The results of this section will require a closer analysis of the function $\mathbf{q}:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ determined by the Krönig-Penney relation (1.5). Recall that $\mathbf{q}$ is anti-symmetric, increasing, and satisfies

$$\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n=\mathbf{q}(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n)=\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\mathbf{q}(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n-\epsilon)<\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\mathbf{q}(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n+\epsilon),\qquad n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

In words, the function $\mathbf{q}$ has jumps at points in $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$ but is continuous from the direction of the origin. It is convenient to view $\mathbf{q}(p)$ over bands $p\in\big(\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}(n-1),\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}n\big]$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$ over which the function is continuous. For each $N\in\mathbb{N}$, define the functions $f_N:[0,\pi]\to[-1,\infty)$ and $g_N:[0,\pi]\to[0,\pi]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} f_N(x) &:= \cos(\pi-x)+\frac{a\alpha M}{\hbar^2}\frac{\sin(\pi-x)}{\pi N-x},\\ g_N(x) &:= f_N^{-1}\big(\cos(\pi-x)\big). \end{aligned}$$

The function $\mathbf{q}:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{q}(p)=\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\Big\lceil\frac{ap}{\pi\hbar}\Big\rceil-\frac{\hbar}{a}g_N\big(\pi\Big\lceil\frac{ap}{\pi\hbar}\Big\rceil-\frac{ap}{\hbar}\big),\qquad p>0. \tag{9.27}$$

The following proposition is a consequence of basic calculus.

Proposition 9.4. *Set* $\upsilon:=\frac{a\alpha M}{\hbar^2}$.

1. *The function* $g_N:[0,\pi]\to[0,\pi]$ *satisfies the differential equation*

$$g_N'(x)=\frac{\sin(\pi-x)}{-\frac{\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)}{\pi N-g_N(x)}+\sin(\pi-g_N(x))+\frac{\upsilon^2\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}+\frac{\upsilon\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}}.$$

2. *The second derivative of* g_N *can be written implicitly in the form*

$$g_N''(x)=-\frac{\frac{\upsilon^2\cos(\pi-x)}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}+r_N(x)}{\big(-\frac{\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)}{\pi N-g_N(x)}+\sin(\pi-g_N(x))+\frac{\upsilon^2\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}+\frac{\upsilon\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}\big)^3},$$

where $r_N:[0,\pi]\to\mathbb{R}$ *is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} r_N(x):=&\frac{2\upsilon^2\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^3}-\frac{3\upsilon^2\sin^2(\pi-g_N(x))\cos(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^4}\\ &+\frac{2\upsilon\sin^3(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^3}-\frac{\upsilon^3\sin^3(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^5}. \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms of the denominators in (1) and (2) can be alternatively written with the equality

$$-\frac{\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)}{\pi N-g_N(x)}+\sin(\pi-g_N(x))=\frac{\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)}{\pi N-g_N(x)}+\frac{\sin^2(\pi-x)}{\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}. \tag{9.28}$$

For the statement of Lem. 9.5, recall that the map $\Theta:\mathbb{R}\to[-\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a},\frac{\pi\hbar}{2a})$ contracts values in $p\in\mathbb{R}$ modulo $\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}$.

Lemma 9.5. *There is $C>0$ such that for all $\lambda<1$ and $p\in\mathbb{R}$,*

1. $\big|\mathbf{q}(p)-p\big|\le C\frac{\frac{\hbar}{a}}{1+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|}$,
2. $\big|\mathbf{q}'(p)-1\big|\le C\min\Big\{1,\,\frac{\frac{\hbar}{a}}{|\theta(p)|(1+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|)}\Big\}$,
3. $\big|\mathbf{q}''(p)\big|\le C\min\Big\{\frac{1}{1+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|},\,\frac{\frac{\hbar^2}{a^2}}{|\theta(p)|^3(1+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|)^2}\Big\}$.

Proof. By the equality (9.27), it is equivalent to show that there is a $C>0$ such that all $x\in[0,\pi)$ and $N\in\mathbb{N}$,

1. $\big|g_N(x)-x\big|\le C\frac{1}{1+N}$,
2. $\Big|g_N'(x)-1\Big|\le C\min\Big\{1,\,\frac{1}{\min\{x,\pi-x\}(1+N)}\Big\}$,
3. $\Big|g_N''(x)\Big|\le C\min\Big\{\frac{1}{1+N},\,\frac{1}{(\min\{x,\pi-x\})^3(1+N)^2}\Big\}$.

Part (1): Clearly $g_N(x)\le x$, since $f_N(x)\ge\cos(\pi-x)$ over the interval $[0,\pi]$. The definition of g_N gives the first equality below:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\upsilon\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{\pi N-g_N(x)}=&\cos(\pi-x)-\cos(\pi-g_N(x))\\ =&\int_0^{x-g_N(x)}dy\,\sin(\pi-g_N(x)-y)\\ \ge&\frac{1}{2}\big(x-g_N(x)\big)\sin(\pi-g_N(x)).\end{aligned}\tag{9.29}$$

The inequality in (9.29) uses that the function $F(y)=\sin(\pi-g_N(x)-y)$ is positive and has derivative greater than -1 for $y\in[0,x-g_N(x)]$. From (9.29), it follows that

$$x-g_N(x)\le\frac{2\upsilon}{\pi N-g_N(x)}=O(N^{-1}).$$

Part (2): It is convenient to use the form $g_N'(x)$ from Part (1) of Lem. 9.4 for the domain $x\in[0,\frac{\pi}{2})$, and the alternative form using the remark (9.28) for the domain $x\in[\frac{\pi}{2},\pi)$. The analysis for the domains are similar, so I will discuss $[0,\frac{\pi}{2})$. By Part (1) of Prop. 9.4 and since the terms $\frac{\upsilon^2\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}$, $\frac{\upsilon\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}{(\pi N-g_N(x))^2}$ in the denominator of the expression for $g_N'(x)$ are positive over the domain $x\in[0,\pi)$, I have the first inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|g_N'(x)-1\Big|&\le\frac{\big|\sin(\pi-g_N(x))-\sin(\pi-x)\big|+O(N^{-2})}{\big|-\frac{\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)}{\pi N-g_N(x)}+\sin(\pi-g_N(x))\big|}\\ &\le\Big(\frac{C}{1+N}+O(N^{-2})\Big)\min\Big\{\frac{N}{-\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)},\frac{1}{\sin(\pi-g_N(x))}\Big\}\\ &\le O(N^{-1})\min{}_+\Big\{\frac{N}{\upsilon\cos(\pi-x)},\frac{1}{\sin(\pi-x)-\frac{C}{1+N}}\Big\},\end{aligned}\tag{9.30}$$

where $\min_+$ refers to the minimum positive value. The second inequality uses that sine has derivative bounded by one and Part (1) to guarantee that there is a $C>0$ such that $|x-g_N(x)|\le\frac{C}{1+N}$. The third inequality bounds the difference between $\sin(\pi-x)$ and $\sin(\pi-g_N(x))$ by $\frac{C}{1+N}$ again. The result can be easily seen by using linear lower bounds for the trigonometric functions on the third line of (9.30).

Part (3): Similar to Part (2).

□

Proof of Part (1) from Lem. 7.1. By writing $E(p\pm\frac{\hbar k}{2})$ in terms of second-order Taylor's formulas and using that $E(p)=\frac{\mathbf{q}^2(p)}{2M}$, I have the equality

$$\begin{aligned} E(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2})-E(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2})-\frac{\hbar k p}{M} =&\frac{\hbar k}{M}\big(\mathbf{q}'(p)\mathbf{q}(p)-p\big) \\ &+\frac{1}{M}\int_{-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}^{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}dv\int_0^v dw\Big(\mathbf{q}(p+w)\mathbf{q}''(p+w)+\big|\mathbf{q}'(p+w)\big|^2\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{9.31}$$

It is thus sufficient to show that the terms on the right side of (9.31) are bounded by a constant multiple of $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}$ for $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ and $p\in\mathbb{R}$ with $|\Theta(p)|\leq\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$. The first term on the right side of (9.31) has the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hbar k}{M}\big|\mathbf{q}'(p)\mathbf{q}(p)-p\big| \leq&\frac{\hbar k}{M}\big|\mathbf{q}(p)\big|\,\big|\mathbf{q}'(p)-1\big|+\frac{\hbar k}{M}\big|\mathbf{q}(p)-p\big| \\ \leq& C\frac{\hbar k}{2\pi M}\big(C\frac{\hbar}{a}+|p|\big)\,\frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varrho}{2}}}{1+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|}+C\frac{\hbar^2 k}{aM(1+\big|\frac{a}{\hbar}p\big|)}, \\ =&\frac{\hbar_0^2}{a_0^2 M_0}O(\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $C>0$ is from applications of Parts (1) and (2) from Lem. 9.5 in the second inequality.

For the second term on the right side of (9.31),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M}\int_{-\frac{\hbar k}{2}}^{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}dv\int_0^v dw\Big(\big|\mathbf{q}(p+w)\big|\,\big|\mathbf{q}''(p+w)\big|+\big|\mathbf{q}'(p+w)\big|^2\Big)& \\ \leq \frac{(\hbar k)^2}{4M}\sup_{\substack{p'\in\mathbb{R},\\ |\Theta(p')|\leq\frac{\pi\hbar}{a}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}}}\big(\big|\mathbf{q}(p')\big|\,\big|\mathbf{q}''(p')\big|+\big|\mathbf{q}'(p')\big|^2\big)& \\ \leq \frac{(\hbar k)^2}{4M}\sup_{p'\in\mathbb{R}}\Big(\frac{\lambda^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3\varrho}{2}}\big(C+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p'|\big)}{8\pi^3\big(1+\big|\frac{a}{\hbar}p'\big|\big)^2}+\frac{\lambda^{-1-\varrho}}{4\pi^2(1+|\frac{a}{\hbar}p'|)^2}\Big)& \\ = \frac{\hbar_0^2}{a_0^2 M_0}O(\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}),& \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by Parts (1)-(3) of Lem. 9.5.

□

9.4.2 Estimates for the coefficients $\kappa_v(p,n)$

Lemma 9.6. *There is a $C>0$ such that for all $\lambda<1$, $p,v\in\mathbb{R}$, and $n\in\mathbb{Z}$,*

1. $\big|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\kappa_v(p,n)\big|\leq C\big(\frac{1}{|\Theta(p)|^2}+\frac{1}{|\Theta(p+v)|^2}\big)$,
2. $\big|\mathrm{Im}\big[\overline{\kappa}_v(p,n)\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\kappa_v(p,n)\big]\big|\leq C\frac{a}{\hbar}$.

Proof.
Part (1): The following formula for $\kappa_v(p,n)$ is equivalent to the definition (1.8):

$$\kappa_v(p,n) = \Big\langle \widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} \,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \widetilde{\psi}_p \Big\rangle. \tag{9.32}$$

By the product rule, the second derivative of $\kappa_v(p,n)$ can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\kappa_v(p,n) =& \Big\langle \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} \,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \widetilde{\psi}_p \Big\rangle + \Big\langle \widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} \,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\widetilde{\psi}_p \Big\rangle \\ &+ 2\Big\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} \,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_p \Big\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{9.33}$$

Since the operator $e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \in \mathcal{B}\big(L^2(\mathbb{T})\big)$ has norm bounded by one,

$$\Big|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\kappa_v(p,n)\Big| \leq \Big\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\Big\|_2 + \Big\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\widetilde{\psi}_p\Big\|_2 + 2\Big\|\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\Big\|_2\Big\|\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_p\Big\|_2. \tag{9.34}$$

The Bloch functions $\widetilde{\psi}_p : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$ have the form (3.2), where the normalization constant N_p is equal to

$$N_p = a + a\frac{1-\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)-p)\big)}{1-\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)\big)} + \frac{2\hbar^2}{\alpha M}\frac{\big|\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}(p)\big)-\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}p\big)\big|^2}{1-\cos\big(\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)\big)}.$$

The first two derivatives of $\widetilde{\psi}_p$ have the forms

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_p = \frac{\frac{a}{\hbar}\psi_p^{(1)}}{e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)}-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\widetilde{\psi}_p = \frac{(\frac{a}{\hbar})^2\psi_p^{(2)}}{\big(e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)}-1\big)^2} + \frac{\frac{a}{\hbar}\mathbf{q}''(p)\psi_p^{(3)}}{e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)}-1} \tag{9.35}$$

for some $\psi_p^{(1)}, \psi_p^{(2)}, \psi_p^{(3)} \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ that are uniformly bounded in norm for all $\lambda < 1$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$. The forms (9.35) use that $N_p \geq a$ is bounded away from zero and that $\mathbf{q}'(p)$ is bounded by Part (2) of Lem. 9.5.

The modulus of the expression $e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)} - 1$ has the lower bound

$$\big|e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{a}{\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)} - 1\big| \geq \frac{1}{\pi}\Big|\frac{a}{\hbar}\Theta\Big(\frac{\mathbf{q}(p)+p}{2}\Big)\Big| \geq \frac{1}{2\pi}\Big|\frac{a}{\hbar}\Theta(p)\Big|, \tag{9.36}$$

where the first inequality is a piecewise linear lower bound for $\big|e^{2\mathrm{i}x}-1\big|$, and the second uses that $q(p) \geq p$. Applying (9.35) and (9.36) in (9.34), I have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 p}\kappa_v(p,n)\Big| \leq& \frac{4\pi^2 B + 2\pi CB}{\big|\Theta(p+v)\big|^2} + \frac{4\pi^2 B + 2\pi CB}{\big|\Theta(p)\big|^2} + \frac{8\pi^2 CB}{\big|\Theta(p)\big|\,\big|\Theta(p+v)\big|} \\ \leq& C'\Big(\frac{1}{\big|\Theta(p)\big|^2} + \frac{1}{\big|\Theta(p+v)\big|^2}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

where the $C > 0$ is from bounding $|\mathbf{q}''(p)|$ with Part (3) of Lem. 9.5, and $B > 0$ is the supremum over $\|\psi_p^{(j)}\|_2$ for $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j \in \{1,2,3\}$. The second inequality is for some C' after applying the relation $2xy \leq x^2 + y^2$ to $x = \frac{1}{|\theta(p)|}$ and $y = \frac{1}{|\theta(p+v)|}$ to the last term in the first line.

Part (2): Differentiating (9.32) gives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\kappa_v(p,n) = \Big\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} \,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \widetilde{\psi}_p \Big\rangle + \Big\langle \widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} \,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\widetilde{\psi}_p \Big\rangle.$$

By the formula (3.2), the Bloch function $\widetilde{\psi}_p \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ has the form $\widetilde{\psi}_p = \psi_p^- + \psi_p^+$ with

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\psi_p^- = \frac{\psi_p^-}{\sin\big(\frac{a}{2\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)\big)} + \psi_p^{-,\prime}, \tag{9.37}$$

where $\psi_p^-, \psi_p^+, \psi_p^{-,\prime}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\psi_p^+ \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ are uniformly bounded in norm for all $\lambda < 1$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Since the factor $\sin\big(\frac{a}{2\hbar}(\mathbf{q}(p)+p)\big)$ is real, I have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathrm{Im}\big[\overline{\kappa}_v(p,n)\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\kappa_v(p,n)\big]\big| =&\Big|\mathrm{Im}\Big[\overline{\kappa}_v(p,n)\Big\langle \psi^{-,\prime}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\psi^+_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\widetilde{\psi}_p\Big\rangle \\ &+ \overline{\kappa}_v(p,n)\Big\langle \widetilde{\psi}_{p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n}\,\Big|\, e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big(\psi_p^{-,\prime} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\psi_p^+\big)\Big\rangle\Big]\Big| \\ \leq& 2\sup_{\substack{\lambda<1,\\ p\in\mathbb{R}}}\max\Big\{\|\psi_p^{-,\prime}\|_2, \|\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\psi_p^+\|_2\Big\} := C.\end{aligned}$$

The inequality above uses that $\kappa_v(p,n) \in \mathbb{C}$, $e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} \in \mathcal{B}\big(L^2(\mathbb{T})\big)$, and $\widetilde{\psi}_p \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ have norms less than one. Since $\psi_p^{-,\prime}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\psi_p^+$ are uniformly bounded in norm, the constant C is finite.

□

Lemma 9.7. *The following variance formula holds for a.e. $(p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^2$:*

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big(E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p+v+n)\,\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2 - \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p+v+m)\,\big|\kappa_v(p,m)\big|^2\Big)^2 \leq \frac{v^2}{M}.$$

Proof. The formula below holds generically for Schrödinger Hamiltonians $H = \frac{P^2}{2M} + V(X)$ and any $v \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{v^2}{M}I = e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}He^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X} + e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}He^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X} - 2H.$$

In particular, this implies that the fiber Hamiltonians H_ϕ, $\phi \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfy

$$\frac{v^2}{M}I = e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}H_{\phi_+}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} + e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}H_{\phi_-}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}} - 2H_\phi \tag{9.38}$$

for $\phi, \phi_\pm \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\phi = p \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$ and $\phi_\pm = p \pm v \bmod \frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}$. Evaluating both sides of (9.38) by $|\widetilde{\psi}_p\rangle$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v^2}{M} =&\big\langle\widetilde{\psi}_p\big|e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}H_{\phi_+}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big|\widetilde{\psi}_p\big\rangle + \big\langle\widetilde{\psi}_p\big|e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}H_{\phi_-}e^{-\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big|\widetilde{\psi}_p\big\rangle - 2\big\langle\widetilde{\psi}_p\big|H_\phi\big|\widetilde{\psi}_p\big\rangle \\ =&\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}E(p+v+n)\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2 + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}E(p-v+n)\big|\kappa_{-v}(p,n)\big|^2 - 2E(p).\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathcal{E}_{p,v} := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p+v+n)\,\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v^2}{M} =&\sum_{\pm}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}E(p\pm v+n)\big|\kappa_{\pm v}(p,n)\big|^2 - 2E(p) \\ =&\sum_{\pm}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big(E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p\pm v+n)\,\big|\kappa_{\pm v}(p,n)\big|^2 - \mathcal{E}_{p,\pm v}\Big)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\Big(\mathcal{E}_{p,v} - \mathcal{E}_{p,-v}\Big)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\mathcal{E}_{p,v} + \mathcal{E}_{p,-v}\Big)^2 - 2E(p).\end{aligned} \tag{9.39}$$

The sum of the last two terms on the right side of (9.39) is positive, since

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_{p,v}+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_{p,-v}-E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)=&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\pm}\big\langle\widetilde{\psi}_p\big|e^{\mp\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}H_{\phi_\pm}^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\pm\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}\big|\widetilde{\psi}_p\big\rangle-\big\langle\widetilde{\psi}_p\big|H_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}\big|\widetilde{\psi}_p\big\rangle\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\pm}{}_Q\big\langle p\big|e^{\mp\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}H^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\pm\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}\big|p\big\rangle_Q-{}_Q\big\langle p\big|H^{\frac{1}{2}}\big|p\big\rangle_Q\\ \geq&0.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\pm}e^{\mp\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}H^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\pm\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}-H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a positive operator; see the proof of Part (2) from [6, Prop.5.1]. The above formal reasoning can be made rigorous by approximating the kets $\big|p\big\rangle_Q$ by elements in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. The operators $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\pm}e^{\mp\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}H_{\phi_\pm}^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\pm\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X_{\mathbb{T}}}-H_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ correspond to the operation of $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\pm}e^{\mp\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}H^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\pm\mathrm{i}\frac{v}{\hbar}X}-H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ on the fiber spaces and thus must be positive.

Since the bottom line of (9.39) is positive, it follows that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big(E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p+v+n)\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2-\mathcal{E}_{p,v}\Big)^2$ is bounded by $\frac{v^2}{M}$.

□

The proof Lem. 7.1 depends most essentially on bounding the difference between the terms $\kappa_v(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)\overline{\kappa}_v(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)$ and $|\kappa_v(p,n)|^2$ through the derivative inequalities in Lem. 9.6. Since there are an infinite number of terms in the sum over $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, I designate cut-offs for the set of n in which I apply the finer estimates and control the remaining terms with the variance inequality of Lem. 9.7 and a Chebyshev bound.

Proof of Part (2) from Lem. 7.1. First, I will bound a single term from the sum. By a Taylor expansion around $p\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\kappa_v(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)\overline{\kappa}_v(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)-\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2\\ &\quad=\mathrm{i}\hbar k\mathrm{Im}\Big[\kappa_v(p,n)\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\overline{\kappa}_v(p,n)\Big]+\int_0^{\frac{\hbar k}{2}}dw'\int_0^{w'}dw\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 w}\Big(\kappa_v(p-w,n)\overline{\kappa}_v(p+w,n)\Big).\end{aligned}\tag{9.40}$$

Applying Parts (1) and (2) of Lem. 9.6 to the absolute value of (9.40) yields constants $C_1,C_2>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\kappa_v(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)\overline{\kappa}_v(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)-\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2\Big|\\ &\qquad\leq C_1ak+\frac{C_2}{2}\big(\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)^2\sup_{|w|\leq|\frac{\hbar k}{2}|}\Big(\frac{1}{|\theta(p+w)|^2}+\frac{1}{|\Theta(p+v+w)|^2}\Big)\\ &\qquad\quad+C_2^2\big(\frac{\hbar k}{2}\big)^4\sup_{|w|\leq|\frac{\hbar k}{2}|}\Big(\frac{1}{|\theta(p+w)|^2}+\frac{1}{|\Theta(p+v+w)|^2}\Big)^2\\ &\qquad\leq C'\lambda^{1+\varrho},\end{aligned}\tag{9.41}$$

where the second inequality is for some $C'>0$ by the constraints $|k|\leq\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$ and $|\Theta(p)|,|\Theta(p+v)|\geq\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}$.

For the full sum of terms, I have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big|\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n\big)-\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2\Big| & \\ \le \sum_{n\in A_{p,v}} & \Big|\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n\big)-\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2\Big| \\ & +2\Big(\sup_{\substack{p'\in\mathbb{R},\\ n\notin A_{p',v}}}\frac{1}{\Big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(p'+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n\big)-\mathcal{E}_{p',v}\Big|^2}\Big) \\ & \times\sup_{p'\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(p'+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n\big)-\mathcal{E}_{p',v}\Big|^2\big|\kappa_v(p',n)\big|^2, \end{aligned}\qquad (9.42)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{p,v}\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and $A_{p,v}\subset\mathbb{Z}$ are defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{p,v}:=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p+v+n)\,\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2\quad\text{and}\quad A_{p,v}:=\Big\{n\in\mathbb{Z}\,\Big|\,\big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p+v+\frac{2\pi\hbar}{a}n)-\mathcal{E}_{p,v}\big|\le\frac{\hbar\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varrho}{2}}}{aM^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big\}.$$

In (9.42), I have applied Chebyshev's inequality and $2|xy|\le|x|^2+|y|^2$ with $x=\kappa_v(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)$ and $y=\overline{\kappa}_v(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n)$ to bound the sum of terms with $n\in A_{p,v}^c$.

By applying (9.41) and Lem. 9.7 respectively to the first and second terms on the right side of (9.42),

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big|\kappa_v\big(p-\frac{\hbar k}{2},n\big)\overline{\kappa}_v\big(p+\frac{\hbar k}{2},n\big)-\big|\kappa_v(p,n)\big|^2\Big|\le C'\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varrho}{2}}+\frac{a^2v^2}{\hbar^2}\lambda^{1+\varrho}.$$

For the above inequality, I have replaced $A_{p,v}$ by the set of $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ with $|n|\le\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varrho}{2}}$. This is possible, since $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p')\approx\frac{|p'|}{\sqrt{2M}}$ for $|p'|\gg\frac{\hbar}{a}$ by Part (1) of Lem. 9.5.

□

9.5 Proofs from Sect. 8

The following proposition is from [6, Prop.6.3] and provides a few inequalities related to the time periods $[\tau_m,\tau_{m+1})$ between successive times τ_m. The assumption in the statement of Prop. 9.8 that K_t does not change signs at the first Poisson time corresponds to the information known if τ_m is a sign-flip. Part (1) of Prop. 9.8 states that the moments for $\frac{\nu(\tau_{m+1}-\tau_m)}{|K_{\tau_m}|}$ are approximately equal to those for a mean-1 exponential, and Part (2) bounds the amount of time that the momentum process spends with the opposite sign before making a sign-flip.

Proposition 9.8. *Let $\zeta>0$, $K_0=p$ for $|p|\gg\frac{\hbar}{a}$, and K_t be conditioned not to make a sign change at the first Poisson time (i.e. $S(K_0)=S(K_{t_1})$). Define τ to be the first time that either K_t has a sign-flip or $|K_t|$ jumps out of the set $[\frac{1}{2}|p|,\,\frac{3}{2}|p|]$ depending on what occurs first. For fixed ζ, $n>0$, there exists a $C>0$ such that the following inequalities hold for all p:*

1. $\Big|\mathbb{E}\big[\big(\frac{\nu\tau}{|p|}\big)^n\big]-n!\Big|\le C|\frac{a}{\hbar}p|^{\zeta-1}$,
2. $\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau dr\chi\big(S(K_r)\neq S(p)\big)\Big]\le C\frac{\hbar}{a\nu}$,

The following lemma bounds the moments for the longest time interval $\Delta\tau_m$ to occur up to time $\min\{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma},\varsigma\}$, and the proof follows easily from Part (1) of Prop. 9.8.

Lemma 9.9. *For any $n \geq 1$ and $\iota > 0$, there is a C such that for all $\lambda < 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sup_{1\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\frac{a\nu\Delta\tau_m}{\hbar}\Big)^n\Big] \leq C\lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}-\iota}.$$

Proof. Pick $\iota \in (0,\gamma)$. Since $|K_t| \leq 2\mathbf{p}$ over for $t \leq \varsigma$, I have the following inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sup_{1\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\frac{a\nu\Delta\tau_m}{\hbar}\Big)^n\Big] \leq \big(\frac{2a\mathbf{p}}{\hbar}\big)^n\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sup_{1\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\frac{\nu\Delta\tau_m}{|K_{\tau_m}|}\Big)^n\Big], \tag{9.43}$$

where $\frac{a\mathbf{p}}{\hbar} = \frac{a_0\mathbf{p}_0}{\hbar_0}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. For $u > \frac{\gamma}{\iota}$, the expectation on the right side of (9.43) can be bound by standard techniques:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sup_{1\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\frac{\nu\Delta\tau_m}{|K_{\tau_m}|}\Big)^n\Big] &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\big(\frac{\nu\Delta\tau_m}{|K_{\tau_m}|}\big)^{nu}\Big]^{\frac{1}{u}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\frac{\nu\Delta\tau_m}{|K_{\tau_m}|}\big)^{nu}\,\Big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m}\Big]\Big]^{\frac{1}{u}} \\
&\leq C_{nu}^{\frac{1}{u}}\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big]^{\frac{1}{u}} \\
&\leq C_{nu}^{\frac{1}{u}}\mathbb{E}\big[\mathcal{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\big]^{\frac{1}{u}} = C_{nu}^{\frac{1}{u}}\big(\frac{T\mathcal{R}}{\lambda^{\gamma}}\big)^{\frac{1}{u}} = O(\lambda^{-\iota}),
\end{aligned} \tag{9.44}$$

where the second inequality holds for some $C_{nu} > 0$ by Part (1) of Prop. 9.8. The first inequality in (9.44) bounds the supreme by a sum and applies Jensen's inequality, and the third inequality uses that the sign-flip times occur at Poisson times. The second equality holds since the Poisson times occur with rate $\mathcal{R}$.

□

The following proposition is from [6, Prop.5.2]. Notice that Parts (1) and (2) are analogous to (1) and (2) of Prop. 4.3. For Part (2), recall that the square of a positive submartingale is also a submartingale.

Proposition 9.10. *Define* $\varsigma := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dv\frac{j(v)}{\mathcal{R}}v^4$.

1. *The square root energy process $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t)$ is a submartingale.*
2. *The increasing part of the Doob-Meyer decomposition for the submartingale $E(K_t)$ has the form $E(K_0) + \frac{\sigma t}{2M}$.*
3. *The second moment of $E(K_t)$ has the bound*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[E^2(K_t)\big] \leq \mathbb{E}\big[E^2(K_0)\big] + \frac{3\sigma t}{2M}\mathbb{E}\big[E(K_0)\big] + \frac{\varsigma\mathcal{R}t}{4M^2} + \frac{3\sigma^2t^2}{8M^2}.$$

The lemma below states that the probably of the process $|K_t|$ leaving the interval $[\mathbf{p}-\lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}+\lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}]$ before time $\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}$ is small for $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1-\gamma}{2})$ and $\lambda \ll 1$. In particular, this implies that the τ_m before time $\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}$ are likely to be all sign-flips.

Lemma 9.11. *For small enough $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big||K_t| - |\mathbf{p}|\big| > \lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}\Big] \leq \frac{64\sigma T}{\mathbf{p}_0^2}\lambda^{1-\gamma-2\epsilon}.$$

Proof. By writing the difference $|K_t| - |\mathbf{p}|$ as

$$\Big(|K_t| - (2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t)\Big) + \Big((2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - (2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\Big) \\ + \Big((2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0) - |K_0|\Big) + \Big(|K_0| - |\mathbf{p}|\Big),$$

I have the inequality

$$\Big||K_t| - |\mathbf{p}|\Big| \leq 2B + \Big||K_0| - |\mathbf{p}|\Big| + \Big|(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - (2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\Big|,$$

where $B := \sup_{p\in\mathbb{R}} \big|(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}E^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) - |p|\big|$. The above inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big||K_t| - |\mathbf{p}|\big| > \lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}\Big] \leq & \mathbb{P}\Big[\big||K_0| - |\mathbf{p}|\big| + B > \lambda^{\epsilon}\frac{\mathbf{p}}{2}\Big] \\ & + \mathbb{P}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\big| > \lambda^{\epsilon}\frac{\mathbf{p}}{2(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.45}$$

The first term on the right side of (9.45) superpolynomially exponentially as $\lambda \to 0$, since K_0 is a Gaussian centered at $\mathbf{p} = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{p}_0$ with width $\frac{\hbar}{2b} = \frac{\hbar_0}{2b_0}$. By Chebyshev's inequalities, I have the first inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{2\epsilon}\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{8M}\mathbb{P}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\big| > \lambda^{\epsilon}\frac{\mathbf{p}}{2(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big] \leq & \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\big|^2\Big] \\ \leq & \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} g_t^2 + \sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\big|_{+}^2\Big] \\ \leq & 4\mathbb{E}\Big[g_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}^2 + \big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\big|_{+}^2\Big] \\ \leq & 8\mathbb{E}\Big[E(K_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}) - E(K_0)\Big] \\ = & \frac{4\sigma T}{M\lambda^{\gamma}}, \end{aligned} \tag{9.46}$$

where g_t is the martingale part in the Doob-Meyer decomposition for $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t)$, and $|x|_{+} := x1_{x\geq 0}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The second inequality follows by neglecting the increasing part in the Doob-Meyer decomposition when $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)$ is negative. Two applications of Doob's maximal inequality gives the third inequality in (9.46), and the equality is by Part (2) of Prop. 9.10. The fourth inequality in (9.46) uses the definition for g_t and that $E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)$ is a submartingale. Thus, I have that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \big|E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_t) - E^{\frac{1}{2}}(K_0)\big| > \lambda^{\epsilon}\frac{\mathbf{p}}{2(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\Big] \leq \frac{32\sigma T}{\mathbf{p}_0^2}\lambda^{1-\gamma-2\epsilon},$$

and for small enough λ, the first term on the right side of (9.45) is smaller than $\frac{32\sigma T}{\mathbf{p}_0^2}\lambda^{1-\gamma-2\epsilon}$ also.

□

Proof of 8.2. The largest jump for the martingale $\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s}$ over the interval $[0, T]$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\big|\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s} - \mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s^-}\big| \leq & \frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sup_{0\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}} dt|K_t| \\ \leq & \frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{\nu M_0}\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}|K_t|\Big)^2\Big(\sup_{1\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}} \chi(\tau_m < \varsigma)\frac{\nu\Delta\tau_m}{|K_{\tau_m}|}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0\le s\le T}\big|\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s}-\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s^-}\big|\Big]\le \frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{\nu M_0}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sup_{0\le t\le \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}|K_t|\Big)^4\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sup_{1\le m\le \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\frac{\nu\Delta\tau_m}{|K_{\tau_m}|}\Big)^2\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{9.47}$$

The first expectation on the right side is uniformly finite for small $\lambda \ll 1$ by the inequality $|K_t|^4 \le 4M^2E_t^2$, Doob's maximal inequality, and the bound on the second moments of E_t from Part (3) of Prop. 9.10. The second expectation on the right side has order $O(\lambda^{\iota})$ for arbitrary $\iota > 0$ by the proof of Lem. 9.9. Thus, I can choose $\iota \in (0, \frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4})$ so that (9.47) tends to zero for small λ.

□

Lemma 9.12. *As $\lambda \to 0$, there is convergence in probability*

$$\sup_{0\le s\le T}\Big|Y_{\lambda,s}-\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dr|K_r|\Big|\Longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof. By Lem. 9.11, the probability of the event $\varsigma \ge \frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}$ is close to one for $\lambda \ll 1$, and thus with probability close to one, the following inequality holds:

$$\sup_{0\le s\le T}\Big|Y_{\lambda,s}-\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dtK_t\Big|\le\frac{2\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sup_{0\le m\le \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt|K_t|.$$

The right side goes to zero by the argument in the proof of Lem. 8.2. Over an interval $t\in[\tau_m,\tau_{m+1})$, the process K_t has the same sign except for isolated Poisson times at which it jumps to the opposite sign and back again at the next Poisson time, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\le s\le T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dtK_t-\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt|K_t|\Big|&\\ \le\frac{2\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt\chi\big(K_t\neq K_{\tau_m}\big)|K_t|.&\end{aligned}$$

The inequalities below bound the total duration of the premature sign changes. The first inequality below holds since $|K_t|\in\big[\frac{1}{2}|K_{\tau_m}|,\frac{3}{2}|K_{\tau_m}|\big]$ for $t\in[\tau_m,\tau_{m+1})$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt\chi\big(K_t\neq K_{\tau_m}\big)|K_t|\Big]&\\ \le\frac{3\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{2M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|\,\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt\chi\big(K_t\neq K_{\tau_m}\big)\,\Big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\Big]\Big]&\\ \le C\frac{3\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{2M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|\Big]&\\ \le 3C\nu\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big]&\end{aligned} \tag{9.48}$$

The second inequality in (9.48) holds for some $C > 0$ by Part (2) of Prop. 9.8. For the third inequality, I have used that $\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m \,\big|\, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big] \approx \nu^{-1}|K_{\tau_m}|$ for large $|\frac{a}{\hbar}K_{\tau_m}|$ by Part (1) of Prop. 9.8, and I have doubled the bound to cover the error. By removing the nested conditional expectations, the bottom line of (9.48) is equal to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 3C\nu\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m\Big] \leq & 3C\nu\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}-1}\Delta\tau_m + \sup_{1\leq m\leq \mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m\Big] \\ \leq & \frac{3C\nu T}{M_0}\Big(\lambda^{\frac{3}{4}-\frac{\gamma}{2}} + O(\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}+\frac{1}{4}-\iota})\Big) \longrightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9.49}$$

for any $\iota > 0$. The last inequality uses that the $\Delta\tau_m$'s sum up to less than $\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}$ for the first term and Lem. 9.9 for the second term.

□

Proof of Part (1) from Lem. 8.1. I can approximate $Y_{\lambda,s}$ by the expression

$$\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt|K_t|$$

for $\lambda \ll 1$ by Lem. 9.12. The result follows by showing the convergences in probability (i)-(iii) below. The differences in (i) and (ii) involve coarse-graining approximations in which the random time intervals $\Delta\tau_m$ are parsed into shorter intervals $\Delta_{m,n}$ with duration on the order $O\big(|\frac{a}{\hbar}K_{\tau_m}|^\beta\big)$ for some β chosen from the interval $(0,\frac{1}{3})$. The proofs of the convergences (i) and (ii) are messy and do not simplify much from the proof of [6, Lem.3.2], so I do not include them. I introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(m) &:= \Big\lfloor \big|\frac{a}{\hbar}K_{\tau_m}\big|^\beta\Big\rfloor, \\ L_m &:= \Big\lfloor \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\tau_{m+1}}-\mathcal{N}_{\tau_m}}{\omega(m)}\Big\rfloor, \\ \Gamma_{m,n} &:= t_{\mathcal{N}_{\tau_m}+nL_m}, \\ \Delta_{m,n} &:= \Gamma_{m,n+1}-\Gamma_{m,n}. \end{aligned}$$

There are the following convergences to zero in probability as $\lambda \to 0$:

(i). $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\Big(\int_{\tau_m}^{\tau_{m+1}}dt|K_t| - \sum_{n=0}^{L_m-1}\Delta_{m,n}|K_{\Gamma_{m,n}}|\Big)\Big| \Longrightarrow 0,$

(ii). $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\Big(\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\sum_{n=0}^{L_m-1}\Delta_{m,n}|K_{\Gamma_{m,n}}| - K_{\tau_m}\Delta\tau_m\Big)\Big| \Longrightarrow 0,$

(iii). $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K_{\tau_m}\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big| \Longrightarrow 0.$

The expression $\mathbf{m}_{\lambda,s} = \frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K_{\tau_m}(\Delta\tau_m - \mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big])$ is obtained by the right term in (ii) minus the expression in (iii).

(iii). I will first show that there is a vanishing error in replacing the terms $\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]$ in the expression by $\nu^{-1}|K_{\tau_m}|$. To bound the difference, I apply Part (1) of Prop. 9.8 to get the first and second inequalities below for $C>0$ depending on my choice of $0<\zeta<\frac{1}{2}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|\,\big|\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]-\nu^{-1}|K_{\tau_m}|\big|\Big]& \\
\leq & C\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\big|K_{\tau_m}\big|\,\big|\frac{a}{\hbar}K_{\tau_m}\big|^{\zeta}\Big] \\
\leq & 2C\nu\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big|\frac{a}{\hbar}K_{\tau_m}\big|^{\zeta}\Big] \\
\leq & 2C\nu\big|\frac{2a\mathbf{p}}{\hbar}\big|^{\zeta}\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}-1}\Delta\tau_m\Big]+\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0\leq m\leq\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m\Big]\Big) \\
\leq & 2C\nu\big|\frac{2a\mathbf{p}}{\hbar}\big|^{\zeta}\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\Big(\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}+C'\frac{\hbar}{a\nu}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota}\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.50}
$$

The third inequality follows by removing the nested conditional expectations, using that $|K_t|\leq 2\mathbf{p}$ for $t<\varsigma$, and bounding the last term in the sum by the largest. The first and second expressions in the fourth line of (9.50) are bounded respectively using that $\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_t-1}\Delta\tau_m\leq t$ and for some C' given $\iota\in(0,\gamma-\frac{1}{2})$ by Lem. 9.9. The bottom line of (9.50) decays as $O(\lambda^{\frac{3}{4}-\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{\zeta}{2}})$.

I am left to bound the expression

$$
\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\Big|\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K_{\tau_m}|K_{\tau_m}|\Big|.
$$

By Lem. 9.11, the probability of the event $\varsigma\geq\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}$ converges to one for small λ. For $\varsigma>t$, the values K_{τ_m} change sign for each $\tau_m\leq t$, and the sum of terms $\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K_{\tau_m}|K_{\tau_m}|$ can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_t}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K_{\tau_m}|K_{\tau_m}|=&\sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N}_t\rfloor}-\chi(\tau_{2m-1}<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_{2m-1}})\Big(|K_{\tau_{2m}}|^2-|K_{\tau_{2m-1}}|^2\Big) \\
&+\chi\big(\mathbf{N}_t\text{ odd}\big)\chi(\tau_{\mathbf{N}_t}<\varsigma)K_{\mathbf{N}_t}|K_{\mathbf{N}_t}|,
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.51}
$$

The remainder term on the second line is bounded by $\chi(\tau_{\mathbf{N}_t}<\varsigma)|K_{\mathbf{N}_t}|^2<4\mathbf{p}^2$ and tends to zero as $\lambda\rightarrow 0$ when multiplied by $\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}$. Moreover, by writing

$$
|K_{\tau_{m+1}}|^2-|K_{\tau_m}|^2=2M\Big(E(K_{\tau_{m+1}})-E(K_{\tau_m})\Big)-\Big(2ME(K_{\tau_{m+1}})-|K_{\tau_{m+1}}|^2\Big)+\Big(2ME(K_{\tau_m})-|K_{\tau_m}|^2\Big)
$$

and using the triangle inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\frac{\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}{M}\Big|\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}-\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\Big(|K_{\tau_{m+1}}|^2-|K_{\tau_m}|^2\Big)\Big|& \\
\leq\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}2\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}\Big|\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}-\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\Big(E(K_{\tau_{m+1}})-E(K_{\tau_m})\Big)\Big|& \\
+2\lambda^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}\sup_{p\in\mathbb{R}}\big|E(p)-\frac{p^2}{2M}\big|\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma).&
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.52}
$$

The supremum of $\big|E(p)-\frac{p^2}{2M}\big|$ for $p\in\mathbb{R}$ is $\frac{\alpha_0}{a_0}O(\lambda)$ for small λ, and the expectation for the sum of terms $\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)$ is $O\big(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}\big)$, since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Big]&\le\frac{2}{\mathbf{p}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi\big(\tau_m<\varsigma\big)\big|K_{\tau_m}\big|\Big]\le\frac{4\nu}{\mathbf{p}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big]\\&\le\frac{4\nu}{\mathbf{p}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}-1}\Delta\tau_m+\sup_{1\le m\le\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi\big(\tau_m<\varsigma\big)\Delta\tau_m\Big]\\&\le\frac{4\nu}{\mathbf{p}}\Big(\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}+\frac{\hbar}{a\nu}O\big(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota}\big)\Big)=O\big(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}\big).\end{aligned}\tag{9.53}$$

where $\iota\in(0,\gamma-\frac{1}{2})$ and the fourth inequality holds since $\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_t-1}\le t$ and by Lem. 9.9. The first inequality above uses that $|K_t|\ge\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}$ for $t<\varsigma$, and the second inequality applies Part (1) of Prop. 9.8. Thus, the third line of (9.52) decays as $O(\lambda^{\frac{5}{4}-\frac{1}{2}\gamma})$.

To bound the first term on the right side of (9.52), it is convenient to write the summand as

$$\begin{aligned}E(K_{\tau_{m+1}})-E(K_{\tau_m})=&\Big(E(K_{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}})-E(K_{\overline{\tau}_m})-\frac{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}-\overline{\tau}_m}{2M}\Big)-\Big(E(K_{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}})-E(K_{\tau_{m+1}})\Big)\\&+\Big(E(K_{\overline{\tau}_m})-E(K_{\tau_m})\Big)+\frac{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}-\overline{\tau}_m}{2M},\end{aligned}\tag{9.54}$$

where $\overline{\tau}_m$ is the Poisson time following τ_m. The times $\overline{\tau}_m$ are hitting times, and the sum

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}-\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)S(K_{\tau_m})\Big(E(K_{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}})-E(K_{\overline{\tau}_m})-\frac{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}-\overline{\tau}_m}{2M}\Big)\tag{9.55}$$

is a martingale, since the terms $E(K_{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}})-E(K_{\overline{\tau}_m})$ have mean $\frac{\overline{\tau}_{m+1}-\overline{\tau}_m}{2M}$ when conditioned on the information known at time $\overline{\tau}_m$ by Part (2) of Prop. 9.10. The supremum of the absolute value for (9.55) over $s\in[0,T]$ can be bounded through Doob's maximal inequality and techniques used previously. The sums associated the other three terms on the right side of (9.54) are treated using the counting techniques in (9.53).

$\square$

Proof of Part (2) from Lem. 8.1. The quadratic variation process for $\mathbf{m}_\lambda$ has the following form:

$$[\mathbf{m}_\lambda,\mathbf{m}_\lambda]_s=\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^2}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K_{\tau_m}^2\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2.$$

I will show the following convergences in probability:

(i). $\sup_{0\le s\le T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^2}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Big(K_{\tau_m}^2\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2-\nu^{-1}|K_{\tau_m}|^3\Delta\tau_m\Big)\Big|\Longrightarrow 0,$

(ii). $\sup_{0\le s\le T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^2\nu}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|^3\Delta\tau_m-s\vartheta\Big|\Longrightarrow 0.$

(i). The difference in the supremum can be written as $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}_{\lambda,s}+\mathbf{W}^{(2)}_{\lambda,s}+\mathbf{W}^{(3)}_{\lambda,s}$ for

$$\mathbf{W}^{(1)}_{\lambda,s}:=\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^2}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K^2_{\tau_m}\Big(\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2-\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2\,\Big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\Big]\Big),$$

$$\mathbf{W}^{(2)}_{\lambda,s}:=\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^2}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K^2_{\tau_m}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2\,\Big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\Big]-\nu^{-1}|K_{\tau_m}|\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big),$$

$$\mathbf{W}^{(3)}_{\lambda,s}:=\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^2\nu}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|^3\Big(\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]-\Delta\tau_m\Big).$$

The processes $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}_{\lambda,s}$ and $\mathbf{W}^{(3)}_{\lambda,s}$ are martingales with respect to the filtration $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\lambda,s}$, The expectation $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}})^2]$ is equal to the expression in the top line of (9.56). Using Part (1) of Prop. 9.8 for the first two inequalities below, the second moment of $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}_{\lambda,\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}$ is bounded through the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\lambda^{2\gamma-1}}{M^4}\sum_{\substack{m=1,\\ \tau_m<\varsigma}}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}}K^4_{\tau_m}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2-\mathbb{E}\big[\big(\Delta\tau_m-\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\big)^2\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big)^2\,\Big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\Big]\Big]\\
&\qquad\le\frac{48}{\nu^4}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\lambda^{2\gamma-1}}{M^4}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)K^8_{\tau_m}\Big]\\
&\qquad\le\frac{96}{\nu^3}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\lambda^{2\gamma-1}}{M^4}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|^7\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta\tau_m\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]\Big]\\
&\qquad\le\frac{96(2\mathbf{p}_0)^7}{\nu^3M_0^4}\lambda^{2\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}-1}\Delta\tau_m\Big]+\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{1\le m\le\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m\Big]\Big)\\
&\qquad\le\frac{96(2\mathbf{p}_0)^7}{\nu^3M_0^4}\lambda^{2\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\frac{T}{\lambda^\gamma}+\frac{\hbar}{a\nu}O(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota})\Big)=O(\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}),
\end{aligned}\tag{9.56}$$

where the last inequality uses that $\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_t-1}\Delta\tau_m<t$ and Lem. 9.9 for $\iota\in(0,\gamma-\frac{1}{2})$. I have multiplied the bounds in the first two inequalities by 2 to cover the error terms for the approximations of the moments $\mathbb{E}\big[(\Delta\tau_m)^n\,\big|\,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_m^-}\big]$ from Prop. 9.8. The third inequality uses that $|K_{\tau_m}|\le 2\mathbf{p}=2\mathbf{p}_0\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for $\tau_m<\varsigma$ and removes the nested conditional expectations. By Doob's maximal inequality, $\mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{0\le s\le T}\big|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}_{\lambda,s}\big|^2\big]$ converges to zero.

The expression $\mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{0\le s\le T}\big|\mathbf{W}^{(2)}_{\lambda,s}\big|\big]$ is bounded by similar applications of Part (1) of Prop. 9.8 as above, and $\mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{0\le s\le T}\big|\mathbf{W}^{(3)}_{\lambda,s}\big|^2\big]$ is bounded using Doob's maximal inequality followed by the standard techniques involving Part (1) of Prop. 9.8.

(ii). By the triangle inequality, I have the first inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\Big|\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^{2}\nu}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{s}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)|K_{\tau_m}|^{3}\Delta\tau_m-s\vartheta\Big|\\
&\quad\leq\frac{\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{M^{2}\nu}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\big||K_{\tau_m}|^{3}-\mathbf{p}^{3}\big|\Delta\tau_m+\vartheta\Big|T-\lambda^{\gamma}\sum_{m=1}^{\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m\Big|\\
&\quad\leq 6T\vartheta\lambda^{\epsilon}+2\vartheta\lambda^{\gamma}\sup_{1\leq m\leq\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}}\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m.
\end{aligned}\tag{9.57}$$

For the first term in the second inequality, I have used that $||K_{\tau_m}|-\mathbf{p}|\leq\lambda^{\epsilon}\mathbf{p}$ for $\tau_m<\varsigma$. The expectation for the supremum of $\chi(\tau_m<\varsigma)\Delta\tau_m$ for $m\leq\mathbf{N}_{\frac{T}{\lambda^{\gamma}}}$ increases with order $O(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota})$ as $\lambda\rightarrow 0$ for any $\iota\in(0,\gamma-\frac{1}{2})$ by Lem. 9.9. Thus, the rightmost expression in (9.57) decays with order $O(\lambda^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}-\iota})$.

□

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the European Research Council grant No. 227772.

References

[1] C. S. Adams, M. Siegel, J. Mlynek: *Atom Optics*, Phys. Rep. **240**, 143-210 (1994).

[2] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Høegh-Krohn, H. Holden: *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag (1988).

[3] R. Alicki: *A search for a border between classical and quantum worlds*, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 034104 (2002).

[4] B. P. Anderson, M. A. Kasevich: *Macroscopic quantum interference from atomic tunnel arrays*, Science **282**, 1686-1689 (1998).

[5] G. Birkl, M. Gatzke, I. H. Deutsch, S. L. Rolston, W. D. Phillips: *Bragg scattering from atoms in optical lattices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2823-2827 (1998).

[6] J. T. Clark: *Suppressed dispersion for a randomly kicked quantum particle in a Dirac comb*, arXiv:1008.4502.

[7] J. Feldmann et al. *Optical investigation of Bloch oscillations in a semiconductor superlattice*, Phys. Rev B **46**, 7252-7255 (1992).

[8] M. I. Freidlin, A. D. Wentzell: *Random perturbations of Hamiltonian systems*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **109**, no. 523, (1994).

[9] N. Friedman, R. Ozeri, N. Davidson: *Quantum reflection of atoms from a periodic dipole potential*, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **15**, 1749-1755 (1998).

[10] M. R. Gallis, G. N. Fleming: *Environmental and spontaneous localization*, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 38-48 (1990).

[11] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rhimini, T. Weber: *Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems*, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 470–491 (1986).

[12] L. Hackermüller, K. Hornberger, B. Brezger, A. Zeilinger, M. Arndt: *Decoherence of matter waves by thermal emission of radiation*, Nature **427**, 711-714 (2004).

[13] M. Hellmich, *Alicki's model of scattering-induced decoherence derived from Hamiltonian dynamics*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **37**, (2004).

[14] A. S. Holevo: *Covariant Quantum Dynamical Semigroups: Unbounded Generators*, 67–81, Lecture Notes in Phys., **504**, Springer, Berlin, (1998).

[15] K. Hornberger, J. Sipe: *Collisional decoherence reexamined*, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 012105 (2003).

[16] K. Hornberger, S. Uttenthaler, B. Brezger, L. Hackermüller, M. Arndt, A. Zeilinger: *Collisional decoherence observed in matter wave interferometry*, Phy. Rev. Let. **90**, 160401 (2005).

[17] K. Hornberger, J. Sipe, M. Arndt: *Theory of decoherence in a matter wave Talbot-Lau interferometer*, Phys. Rev. A **70** 053608 (2004).

[18] S. Kunze, S. Dürr, G. Rempe: *Bragg scattering of slow atoms from a standing light wave*, Europhys. Lett. **34**, 343-348 (1996).

[19] G. Lindblad: *On the Generators of Quantum Dynamical Semigroups*, Comm. Math. Phys. **48**, 119-130 (1976).

[20] D. Pollard: *Convergence of Stochastic Processes*, Springer-Verlag, 1984.

[21] M. Reed, B. Simon: *Methods of modern mathematical physics, Vol. I: Functional analysis*, Academic Press, 1980.

[22] M. Reed, B. Simon: *Methods of modern mathematical physics, Vol. IV: Analysis of operators*, Academic Press, 1980.

[23] B. Vacchini, K. Hornberger: *Quantum linear Boltzmann equation*, Phys. Rep. **478**, 71-120 (2009).

[24] B. Vacchini: *Theory of decoherence due to scattering events and Lévy processes*, Phy. Rev. Let. **95**, 230402 (2005).